

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management :

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
Prof. A. C. OLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
L. WHIBLEY, M.A.  
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.  
(Hon. Treasurer).

With the Chairman,  
representing the Council  
of the Classical  
Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing  
the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the  
Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. E. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XLV

MAY, 1931

No. 2

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	49	REVIEWS (continued) :	
EMPEDOCLES IN EXILE. G. M. TUCKER ..	49	Medallions (Aldington). J. W. MACKAIL ..	71
TV MARCELLVS ERIS. H. J. ROSE ..	51	From Orpheus to Paul (Macchioro) W. K. C.	
NOTES ON LIVY. I. R. L. DUNBABIN ..	52	GUTHRIE ..	72
REVIEWS :		Animals in Greek Sculpture (Richter). E. S.	
<i>Athletics of the Ancient World</i> (Gardiner).		FORSTER ..	73
R. L. HOWLAND ..	57	Terra Mater (Altheim). H. J. ROSE ..	74
<i>Selections from the 'Brief Mention' of Basil</i>		Catos Hausbücher (Hörle). C. J. FORDYCE	76
Lanneau Gildersleeve. E. HARRISON ..	59	Cicero's Letters to Atticus, Book II. (Alford).	
<i>A Greek-English Lexicon. Part 5</i> (Liddell and		W. T. VESEY ..	77
Scott, etc.). E. HARRISON ..	59	A la campagne avec Virgile (d'Hérouville).	
<i>Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue grecque</i>		T. F. ROYDS ..	79
(Meillet). P. S. NOBLE ..	60	Q. Orazio Flacco : Il Libro degli Epodi (Giar-	
<i>Die griechische Tragödie</i> (Pohlenz). A. W.		ratano); Le Satire (d' Agostino). A. S.	
PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE ..	61	OWEN ..	80
<i>Aristophane, L'Assemblée des Femmes, Ploutos</i>		Martial, Épigrammes, Tome I. (Izaac). A. E.	
(Coulon et van Daele). F. W. HALL ..	62	HOUSMAN ..	81
<i>Andocide, Discours</i> (Dalmeyda). E. C. MAR-		Flavii Arriani scripta minora et fragmenta	
CHANT ..	63	(Roos); Anabasis Alexandri, Books I.-IV.	
<i>Platon : II. Die platonischen Schriften</i> (Fried-		(Robson). J. O. THOMSON ..	83
länder). A. E. TAYLOR ..	64	The Archaeology of Roman Britain (Colling-	
<i>Platon : Dialogues suspects, Dialogues apocryphes</i>		wood). H. MATTINGLY ..	84
(Souilhé). W. R. M. LAMB ..	68	Der Untergang Roms im abendländischen Denken	
<i>Theophrastus, Metaphysics</i> (Ross and Fobes).		(Rehm). R. SYME ..	85
J. L. STOCKS ..	69	SHORT REVIEWS ..	86
<i>Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments</i>		SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS ..	92
(Tarn). M. CARY ..	70	CORRESPONDENCE ..	94
		BOOKS RECEIVED ..	94

LONDON : JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK : G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3  
Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW  
25s net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; inquiries to the Hon. Secretaries, Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury, c/o The Triangle Secretarial Offices, 61, South Molton St., London, W. 1; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Miss H. Lister, Manchester High School for Girls; Dr. G. A. Auden, 42, Lordswood Road, Harborne, Birmingham; Mr. G. B. A. Fletcher, The University, Liverpool; Professor F. S. Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. Pitman, The University, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss W. A. Greatbatch, 150, Park Road, W. 4; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Lake Road West, Cardiff; Mr. D. E. F. Binyon, The University, Leeds; Miss A. I. S. Smith, West Leeds High School for Girls, Armley, Leeds; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. M. Towne, County School for Girls, Beckenham; Mr. T. B. L. Webster, Christ Church, Oxford; Mr. F. P. B. Shipham, 48, Rutland Gardens, Hove; Mrs. F. G. Maunsell, University College, Southampton; Professor F. Fletcher, 48, Polsloe Road, Exeter; Dr. G. H. Goldsmith, 6, Bromham Road, Bedford; Dr. M. M. Gillies, The University, Hull; Miss N. C. Jolliffe, The University, Reading; Mr. G. H. P. P. Tredennick, 28, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield; Mr. H. Hill, University College, Swansea; Mr. D. L. Hewitt, Wyggeston School for Boys, Leicester; Mr. R. Dobbin, 326, Montreal Street, Christchurch, New Zealand; Dr. W. H. S. Jones, St. Catharine's College, Cambridge; Mr. A. M. Moore, Byam's, Fitzhead, Taunton.

## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by T. E. PAGE, Litt.D., E. CAPPS, Ph.D., LL.D.,  
and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net.  
Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

NEW BOOKS READY, 1931

SPRING (ready end of June)

### Latin

249. *Tacitus*. Vol. II. (Histories books III. and IV., Annals Books I.-III. C. H. MOORE and J. JACKSON.

250. *Tertullian: Apologia and De Spectaculis, and Minucius Felix*. T. R. GLOVER and G. H. RENDALL.

251. *Vitruvius*. In 2 vols. Vol. I. F. GRANGER.

### Latin

252. *Cicero: Pro Milone, Pro Scauro, Pro Fonteio, In Pisonem, Pro Rabirio Postumo, Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro Rege Deiotaro*. N. H. WATTS.

### Greek

150. *Hippocrates*, Vol. IV., and *Heracleitus*. W. H. S. JONES.

245. *Plutarch: Moralia*. In 14 vols. Vol. III. F. C. BABBITT.

*Machines or Mind?* (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library)

FREE together with *Descriptive Prospectus*, etc.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

nd  
on  
al  
to  
te

al  
s.  
gs  
al  
al  
re  
st

se,  
M.  
he  
er ;  
ad,  
S.  
sil  
ch,  
fr.  
ls,  
es,  
L.  
G.  
er ;  
ty,  
ch  
on  
d ;  
ad,





# The Classical Review

MAY, 1931

## NOTES AND NEWS

'UPWARDS of twenty years ago Professor J. H. Moulton asked me to join with him in an effort to illustrate the *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* from recently discovered non-literary texts.' Moulton was happy in his choice of a colleague who was destined to be his executor and the independent author of a large part of his most ambitious work, and the completed *Vocabulary*, now published in one volume with an Introduction by Professor Milligan, is a solid and massive contribution to Greek Lexicography. Two parts of the *Vocabulary*, reaching from ἀβαρής to δωροφορία, had been completed when Moulton died in 1915; the remaining six parts are the work of Professor Milligan. The work is already familiar to students of the New Testament in all lands, and has probably done more to bring up-to-date precision within the reach of Biblical students than any other of the numerous recent works which have drawn on the inscriptions and the Egyptian non-literary papyri to illustrate vernacular Hellenistic Greek.

But it is not only the papyri and inscriptions which have been ransacked for this volume; the revelations made by these new sources have led to a fresh study of Hellenistic literary texts, the fruits of which are represented almost on every page. Professor Milligan is at pains to disclaim finality; finality is the last thing the users of this *Vocabulary* expect or desire—it will be a sad day when the tale of epigraphical and papyrological discovery is complete.

Two correspondents have written to point out that Dr. Rouse's note on προβατογνώμων in the February issue of the *Classical Review* (p. 14) answers Question no. 25 in Calverley's examination paper on 'The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club,' set at Cambridge in 1857. The question is worded as follows: "Προβατογνώμων: a good judge of cattle; hence a good judge of character." Note on Aesch. Ag.—Illustrate the theory involved by a remark of the parent Weller.'

## EMPEDOCLES IN EXILE.

Ω φίλοι, οὐ μέγα ἄστυ κατὰ ξανθοῦ Ἀκράγατος  
ναίει' ἀν' ἄκρα πόλεος, ἀγαθῶν μελεδήμονες ἔργων,  
ξείνων αἰδοῖσι λιμένες, κακότητος ἀπειροί,  
χαίρει'· ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν θεὸς ἀμβροτος, οὐκέτι θνητός,  
5 πωλεῖμαι μετὰ πᾶσι τετιμένους ὥσπερ εἰκοα,  
ταυρίας τε περίστεπτος στέφειν τε θαλείοις·  
τοῖσιν ἄμ' <εἶν' > ἀν' ἱκωμαι ἐς ἄστυα τηλεθάοντα  
ἀνδράσιν ἢ δὲ γυναῖξι σεβίζομαι· οἱ δ' ἄμ' ἔπονται  
μυριοί, κ.τ.λ.

Empedocles, Καθαροὶ init. (Fr. 112 Diels)

LUCIAN tells us (*Pro lapsu int. sal. I.*) that χαίρει in line 4 means 'farewell.' As Lucian is there drawing careful distinctions between the various meanings of the word, citing well-known<sup>1</sup> quotations to support his distinctions, his evidence seems dependable, especially as there seems to be no other

ancient authority for the interpretation of this line. The emphatic position of χαίρει, which is placed, after three lines of vocatives, as first word in its line, with a pause separating it from the words following, had already suggested to me, before comparing the passage of Lucian, that the accepted rendering 'all hail' was too weak. The rendering 'farewell,' on the other hand, accords well with the emphasis, as well as with the general tone of the whole poem, which, as Diels<sup>2</sup> pointed out,

<sup>2</sup> In *Berl. Sitzb.* 1898, pp. 396 sqq. In *Fragm. d. Vors.*, the reference to Lucian is omitted; in his *Scriptores Philosophi Graeci*, the reference is given without quoting the passages. His translation (*Vors.*) is 'seid mir begrüsst.'

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that he cites them without naming the authors.

strongly suggests that Empedocles wrote the lines after he had been exiled. At all events it seems certain that he must have been away from Acragas when he wrote. The tenses of the verbs *πωλεῖμαι*, *σεβίζομαι*, *ἔπονται*, combined with the fulness of the description of his triumphal progress through the cities, are sufficient to establish this. There are other points in the lines which support the inference. In the first place, in the words *ξείνων αἰδοῖσι λιμένες* Empedocles seems to contrast his own banishment with that hospitality to strangers which, as Diodorus tells us (XIII 83), was the great pride of the Acragantines. If *αἰδοῖσι* is active in sense, as seems probable, the word *ξείνων* receives a stress in reading the line that makes this contrast more noticeable. In the sentence beginning at *ἐγὼ δ'* (line 4) there are further indications that heighten this contrast. The phrase *τετιμένος ὥσπερ ἔοικα* ('honoured as I deserve'), which on the ordinary view of the passage is little better than a metrical stop-gap, gains in pointedness if it is taken to imply that he had previously not been accorded this honour. Again, the word *τοῖσιν*, in line 7, receives a stress from its position as first word in both line and sentence, which is caught up and strengthened by the repetition in the next line of *οἱ δ'*; and this stress is accounted for on the view suggested.

If, however, Lucian's interpretation is correct, Diels' suggestion that Empedocles is describing his triumphs to his friends in Acragas in the hope of securing a recall can hardly be allowed. Instead, we must look on the passage as containing a long farewell to Acragas. The tone is, however, triumphant and boastful, and seems meant to convey to those he addresses scornful contempt rather than friendliness. In view of this it seems possible that the compliments of the second and third lines are not to be taken at their face value. At all events the phrase already considered, *ξείνων αἰδοῖσι λιμένες*, has been seen to convey not a compliment but a reproach. It may be tentatively suggested that, read in the light of the situation in which they were written, the other phrases would be seen to be

ironical. Clement of Alexandria has preserved a fragment which may support this suggestion. He writes (*Protr.* 2, 27: [I, 20, 13 St.]) *ὑμῖν δὲ καὶ ὁ ὑμέτερος ὑποδύεται ποιητῆς ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνος Ἐμπεδοκλῆς*.

τοιγάρτοι χαλεπήσιν ἄλλοις κακότησιν  
ὅποτε δειλαίων ἄχων λωφίσσετε θυμόν.

(Fr. 145 Diels.)

The words with which Clement introduces these lines suggest that they are not spoken by a character introduced in the poem, but uttered by the poet himself to his readers. As he started by addressing some or all of the Acragantines, he is probably still addressing them here. Now the sentiment of the two lines is in complete opposition to all that we know of his theory of sin and the soul, which gave all living things hope of salvation (*cf.* Plut. *de exil.* 17 p. 607 c, cited by Diels on fr. 115). This fact makes it probable that Empedocles is here writing under the influence of personal feeling. The first line may even be intended to recall line 3 of the poem.

I conclude, then, first, that the poem was written in exile, and contains a farewell to Acragas; and, secondly, that, in spite of the seeming compliments in lines 2 and 3, it may have been addressed to the poet's enemies, not to his friends. Apart from the passage of Lucian, there seems to be no external evidence bearing on these conclusions. It is a point in favour of the first, however, that in Diogenes Laertius VIII 67 it is *οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀπόγονοι* that oppose Empedocles' recall; this suggests an early date for his banishment. The corrupt passage in Diogenes VIII 66 may also be adduced. The MSS. read (*ὁ Τίμαιος*) . . . *φησὶν ἐναντίαν ἐσχηκέναι γνώμην αὐτόν τε τῇ πολιτείᾳ φαίνεσθαι. ὅπου δὲ ἀλαζόνα καὶ φίλαντον ἐν τῇ ποίησει φησὶ γοῦν*

χαίρετ' · ἐγὼ δ' . . .  
πωλεῖμαι, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς . . .

It is possible here that the first clause means 'that he seems to have come to hold an opposite opinion to the polity (of Acragas),' in which case the lines of the poem were cited by Diogenes or his authority to support this statement,

and must have been held to contain in themselves evidence of this opposition. It should, however, be added that editors generally assume a lacuna, and construe the passage as meaning that Empedocles as a statesman was demo-

cratic, but in his poetry was proud and selfish.<sup>1</sup>

G. M. TUCKER.

King's College, Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> The author wishes to thank Mr. J. T. Sheppard for his kind assistance in preparing this article for publication.

### TV MARCELLVS ERIS.

RECENTLY, while helping two of my children through the sixth *Aeneid*, I was not surprised to find that their school edition said little that was worth saying on lines 883-4, for I knew that Conington's note was wrong. But I was not then aware that all the commentators, so far as I have been able to consult them, fall into three classes. The first contents itself with a sphinx-like silence, and thereby certainly avoids making mistakes. The second agrees with Servius, that *Marcellus* means *talis qualis Marcellus*, which poor dish they spice in various ways, according to their individual tastes. The third, which includes some respectable scholars such as Forbiger, takes *si . . . rumpas* as a wish, not a condition. Norden tries to compromise by saying that it is a combination of wish and condition.

Of the two articulate classes, the former is wrong, because Vergil, in one of his finest and most admired passages, certainly did not write anything so flat. 'Thou shalt be a Marcellus' can mean but one thing, and that is, as Heyne sees in his note, 'thou shalt be no less great than the great opponent of Hannibal.' That is to say, after skilfully lauding the Imperial house, so as to put its head above all other men and even above Dionysos and Herakles (791-805), Vergil is taken as saying that the hope and pride of that house, if he had lived, would have been as good as a first-rate Republican general; the son and grandson, at least by adoption, of gods, is to become quite a superior mortal, much better than the average public servant! Octavia would not have paid a million sesterii for every line of such praise, nor fainted with emotion at hearing it.

Those who take *si . . . rumpas* as

equivalent to *utinam . . . rumpas* do at least arrive at a very tolerable sense. 'Thou shalt be Marcellus the beloved heir to the throne; would that thou mightest overcome the cruelty of fate and fulfil the promise of so brilliant an early career' is a quite understandable panegyric on a youth in whom, according to the much-quoted rule of the rhetoricians, there can be no more than hopes to praise. But Vergil himself indicates in the plainest manner that this is not how the passage is to be understood. The speech is not put into the mouth of Apollo, or of any other god, who might be in the confidence of Destiny, but of the beatified spirit of a wise and experienced man. It is therefore reasonable to assume superhuman knowledge of the future, but not perfect certainty; and this is precisely what Vergil does. Anchises is not absolutely certain of the future career of any of the souls whom he shows to Aeneas, and he says so more than once. Thus, line 770, Aeneas Silvius will be

pariter pietate uel armis  
egregius, si unquam regnandam acceperit  
Albam.

Again, in line 828, Caesar and Pompey will make war on each other

si lumina uitae

attigerint.

In these cases I should regard *acceperit*, *attigerint* as perfect subjunctive, not future perfect.

Anchises has more than a living man's insight into the characters of these spirits, and therefore can speak with assurance of the lives they will lead, assuming that they are to return to earth (and reach maturity) at all. Only in one case is he obviously free from all doubt, for I do not count the many instances in which he simply

omits, to avoid an un-Vergilian monotony, the conditional clause.<sup>1</sup> That is the case of Augustus, and here he plainly indicates that he is relying, at least in part, on oracles of the gods (*responsis diuum*, 799). He is not sure how posterity will regard the action of Brutus, 822, or whether the Greeks will really excel the Romans in the fine arts, 848.

In the light of these passages, I do not see how we can hesitate to render lines 882-3 in a perfectly straightforward manner: 'Alas, unhappy lad, if thou canst in any way attempt to break through' (conative present) 'the cruelty of Fate, thou shalt be Marcellus.' Knowing, from the aspect of the spirit, that Marcellus is doomed to death, Anchises is not sure even that he will succeed in being born, or in surviving early childhood. But if he does, it is certain (hence, as in the other passages cited, the change to the indicative) that during his short life he will be. . . . Here

<sup>1</sup> So even the most meticulously pious do not always add 'D.V.' to statements of their intended actions.

an inferior artist would have lavished his store of compliments; Vergil, better artist and better courtier, is contented with naming one who seems to have been in reality, and not without reason, the darling of Rome.

As to the meaning of 'breaking through fate,' I do not wish to add to the already considerable literature on the Vergilian use of *fatum*, *faata*, further than to say that, for him as for any other poet from Homer<sup>2</sup> on, Fate must be, not an unbreakable chain of causality which leaves no play for the individual will, but a mysterious power, tending to be personified or identified with a personal god; a power which must always win in the end, but which man may at least try to set at defiance, and even, perhaps, succeed in modifying to some small extent, doing or suffering something *ὑπὲρ μῦθον*.

H. J. ROSE.

*St. Andrews University.*

<sup>2</sup> Some good remarks on this subject, by G. Patroni, will be found in the *Rendiconti del reale istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere*, Vol. LXIII. fasc. xvi-xviii (Milan, 1930, IX.).

#### NOTES ON LIVY. I.

21. 31, § 4. *Quartis castris ad Insulam peruenit. Ibi Isara Rhodanusque . . .*

CONWAY and Walters say 'Ibi sarar M: bisarar D: ibi arar CM\* per ras. AN: Isara Cluuerius, sed hos amnes excludit dierum ratio,' and refer to Professor Spenser Wilkinson's *Hannibal's Route through the Alps*. He supposes that the Island was formed by the Rhone and the Sorgues, and Professor Conway accordingly would read *Ibi Sorga*.

Now it must be admitted that the *dierum ratio* on the whole strongly supports Professor Wilkinson's theory as to Hannibal's route. It is certain that the crossing-place could not have been much higher up the Rhone than Tarascon, for it was 'about four days' march from the sea for an army' (Pol. 3. 42, § 1), i.e. about 40 Roman miles. The qualification *στρατοπέδῳ* is not idle, for in 2. 55, § 1 Polybius says Aegium is distant *τριῶν ἡμερῶν ὁδόν* from Megalopolis. To judge from the

maps, the distance is over 60 English miles as the crow flies. So there he means three days' journey for a single traveller, but here four days' march. It is probable that he based his statement on Scipio's march from the eastern mouth to the crossing, for Scipio appears to have taken about four days. Tarascon is about 35 English miles from that mouth. If Hannibal had crossed at Roquemaure, as is commonly supposed, he would have been nearly 60 English miles from the sea, or six days' march.<sup>1</sup> And it is

<sup>1</sup> The distances I give were obtained partly by map-measurement, but usually from Muirhead's Guides to Southern France, Northern Italy, and Southern Italy, from *Itineraria Romana*, ed. Cuntz, vol. I., 1929, and from Strabo. As a rule the distance in English miles by rail is nearly the same as that in Roman miles by the Roman road, e.g. Strabo, p. 185, says it is 320 stades from the Isère to Vienne, i.e. 40 Roman miles; it is 40½ English miles by rail. A Roman military road was always much straighter than a modern railway; the roads of Spain and Gaul in Polybius' time were doubt-



equally clear that Hannibal crossed the Alps by a pass that commanded a view of the plains about the Po (Pol. 3. 54, §§ 2, 3; Liv. 21. 35, § 8) and brought him down into the territory of the Taurini (Pol. 3. 60, §§ 2, 8; Liv. 21. 38, §§ 5, 6). Professor Wilkinson has proved conclusively that this pass was the Col du Clapier, that Hannibal reached it by following first the Isère and then the Arc, and that the 'ascent of the Alps' began at St. Quentin on the Isère below Grenoble. No other route corresponds to the data given by Polybius and Livy. According to Polybius, Hannibal marched from the crossing-place to the ascent of the Alps in fourteen days, and crossed the Alps in fifteen more days' marching. It is about 134 English miles from Tarascon to St. Quentin, and about 137 from there to Avigliana.

But when we come back to the Island Professor Wilkinson's arguments are less satisfactory. Polybius (3. 49, § 5) and Livy agree that Hannibal reached the Island after marching for four days from the crossing. Professor Wilkinson says Hannibal would reach the Sorgues on the third day (*op. cit.*, p. 19). It is clear, therefore, that at the end of the fourth day he would be at least a day's march further on, and that Professor Wilkinson should have supposed that the Island was formed by the next tributary of the Rhone, viz. the Aygues (or Eygues), which is about 10 English miles further on. Polybius reckons 1,400 stades from the crossing to the ascent of the Alps (3. 39, § 9), and 800 from the Island to the ascent (3. 50, § 1). Hence it would follow that he supposed it was 600 stades from the crossing to the Island, i.e. about 66 English miles. This would bring Hannibal to the Roubion, which is about 65 miles from Tarascon. But in that case the distance to the ascent of the Alps at St. Quentin would be under 69 English miles, whereas Polybius allows for this stage ten days and 800 stades, i.e. nearly 92 English miles. That is, if Polybius'

less more roundabout than Roman roads, but less so than railways. Hence distances given in English miles are usually greater than those Hannibal had to march.

numbers are correct, Hannibal marched 16½ English miles a day to the Island, and less than 7 a day for the next ten days. As he had three days' start of Scipio, there was no reason for making four forced marches at that stage. It is plain that Polybius' distances were merely inferences from the number of days of Hannibal's march or his own journey; and he seems to have reckoned sometimes 80 stades and sometimes 100 as a day's march. Also he seems to have made mistakes in his addition. He says in ch. 39 that the distance from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Pyrenees, which divide Spain from Gaul, is about 8,000 stades. 'For it is 3,000 from the Straits to New Carthage, where Hannibal began his march, and from New Carthage to the river Ebro 2,600, and from it to Emporion 1,600, and from there to the crossing of the Rhone about 1,600, and from the crossing along the river itself to the ascent of the Alps 1,400, and finally there is the crossing of the Alps, about 1,200; so that the total from New Carthage is about 9,000.' Now Emporion was not on the frontier, and the distances given are 800 stades short of his total of 'about 8,000.' Again, the distances from New Carthage to Italy add up to 8,400, which is 600 short of his total. Hence it is commonly supposed that a clause has dropped out after Emporion, 'and from there to the Pyrenees about 600 stades.' But this will not make his first total right, since he requires 800 stades for that. And to judge from the map the distance from Emporion to the Pyrenees is well under 160 stades. Strabo (p. 159) says it was only 40. So it is best to disregard Polybius' distances and take account only of the number of days. Four days' normal marching would bring Hannibal, not to the Sorgues nor to the Roubion, but to the Aygues. A further objection to Professor Wilkinson's theory is that the Sorgues flows into the Rhone from the south, and there are no mountains between it and the Rhone to form the third side of the triangle. Anyone who looks at a map and observes the position of L'Isle-sur-la-Sorgue and the low elevation of the country between it and the Rhone

will see at a glance that, even if this district was called 'the Island,' as the name L'Isle-sur-la-Sorgue suggests, it cannot have been Polybius' Island. That the Island was not at the Roubion follows from Livy (21. 31, § 9), where he says that, instead of making straight for the Alps from the Island, Hannibal now turned to the left into the territory of the Tricastini. Augusta Tricastinorum was their chief town (Pliny, *N.H.* 3, § 36). This is St. Paul-Trois-Châteaux,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  miles from Pierrelatte, and once the seat of the bishopric 'civitatis Tricastinorum' (Holder, *Alt-keltischer Sprachschatz*, s.v., and Muirhead's *Southern France*, p. 97). If the Island were at the Roubion, he would have been already in the territory of the Tricastini, and so could not have turned left into it. Livy's narrative continues to agree with Polybius, for he says (21. 31, § 9) that Hannibal next passed through the extreme edge of the Vocontii, making for the Tricorii. In Strabo's time the Cavares or Cavari occupied all the country along the eastern bank of the Rhone from the Durance to the Isère (Strabo, p. 185). Avenio and Valentia were towns of theirs (Pliny, *N.H.* 3, § 36). The Vocontii and Tricorii lived to the eastward of the Cavares (Strabo, l.c.). Vasio and Lucus Augusti were their chief towns (Pliny, *N.H.* 3, § 37). Dea Vocontiorum (Die on the Drôme), Vapincum, and Civitas Segesteriorum were also towns of theirs (Holder, s.v.), i.e. they lived chiefly in the mountains to the east of the Rhone valley. Their territory was bounded on the north by that of the Allobroges (Strabo, p. 203; cf. *Caes. B.G.* 1. 10, § 5). As Grenoble was a town of the Allobroges in Cicero's time (*Cic. Fam.* 10. 23, § 7), the territory of the Allobroges then extended to the south of the Isère. Thus, when Hannibal crossed the Drôme, he would be on the edge of the territory of the Vocontii. The position of the Tricorii seems to be less clearly determined. Holder, s.v., says they lived in the valley of the Drac to the south of Grenoble. If so, this indication of Hannibal's route agrees with Polybius.

There can be no doubt that Livy and Polybius are describing the same route,

and that the Island was at the Aygues. The name Aygues is merely the Latin *aquas*; the Celtic name of the river is unknown. The next question is, what did Polybius and Livy call it? Considering how closely their accounts agree in the main, one would expect them to give the same name to it. The variant readings in Livy point to *Ibi Isara* with a suprascript variant *Arar*, which has become *ibi sarar* in M, *bisara* in D, and *ibi arar* in the rest; while Polybius' *Σάρας* might easily have arisen from an uncial corruption of OICAPAC. The emendations *Ibi Isara* in Livy and *ὁ Ἰσάρας* in Polybius would bring them into harmony. But we need not suppose that this Isara was the Isara which is now the Isère. It was and is a common thing for several places to have the same name. There were forty-two Celtic towns or villages called Mediolanum (or -ium) (Holder, s.v.). In Roman Britain Isca was the name of the Exe, the Usk, and doubtless of the many Esks. At least six rivers in Britain were called Tamesa: (i.) the Thames; (ii.) a part of the Ouse which has given its name to Tempsford (Temesanford in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: see Mawer and Stenton, *Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire*, pp. 110, 111); (iii.) the estuary of the Colne, for Colne is merely a 'back-formation' from the O.E. Colneceaster (Zachrisson, *Romans, Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain*, p. 79), and *Tamesa* in Tacitus, *Ann.* 14. 32, § 2 is in all likelihood the estuary of the Colne. And according to Smith, *Place-Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire*, p. 6, the river-name Tame in Yorkshire 'is identical with the river-names Tame (Staffordshire and Warwickshire) and Thames, with Welsh *Taff* and the old Indian river-name *Tamassa*.' Again, the name Severn was once borne, not only by the famous river in the west country, but also by a little stream in Bedfordshire (Mawer and Stenton, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10). Two streams were called Druentia; one is now the Durance, the other the Drance, which flows into the Lake of Geneva (Holder, s.v.). There were at least three rivers called Isara in the Celtic area of the Roman Empire; they are now the Isère, the Oise, and



the Isar. So it would not be very remarkable if the Rhone had two tributaries of that name. It may be objected that Polybius, who had seen the other Isara, would have been careful to indicate which of the two was meant here. But Polybius' topography was far from exact. Though he had been over Hannibal's route himself, he represents Hannibal as marching east up the Rhone when he was really marching due north (3. 47, § 1). And he evidently thought the Isère was part of the Rhone, for he says Hannibal followed 'the river' till he reached the Alps (3. 39, § 9; 50, § 1), and it is plain from a comparison of his statements (παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν ποταμὸν, 3. 39, § 9, παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν, 47, § 1 and 50, § 1) that he means the same river in all of them. Probably neither Hannibal nor Polybius followed the Rhone to the point where the Isère joins it, but took a short cut across the plain. When Polybius reached the Isère he thought he was still on the Rhone, so in all likelihood he never discovered that there was a second Isara in the Rhone valley. Livy's authorities may have been equally ignorant, and, so far as we know, Livy himself had not seen the country. If he had already heard of the Isère, he doubtless thought that this was it. I would suggest, therefore, that Cluverius' emendation should be retained, and that this Isara was the Aygues.<sup>1</sup>

21. 31, § 9. Conway and Walters keep *Trigorios* with the MSS. But the spelling *Tricorios* does not depend merely on Ammianus Marcellinus (15. 10, § 11), for Pliny, *N.H.* 3, § 34, has *Tricorium*, and the MSS. of Strabo, to judge from the silence of the old commentators, have *Τρικόριος* in pp. 185, 203. And this spelling is confirmed by the etymology; see Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*<sup>2</sup>, I. 1, p. 144, where *Tricorii* is connected with *κοίρανος* (army-leader) and the Gothic *harjis* (army). Thus *Tricorii* means 'the nation with three armies';

<sup>1</sup> Or it may be that *Σκάρας* in Polybius is sound, and that the corruptions in Livy arose from *scara*. The name *Scara* does not occur elsewhere, but that is not a sufficient reason for rejecting it.

cf. *Petro-corii* (Caes. *B.G.* 7. 75, § 4. Pliny, *N.H.* 4, § 109), *Πετροκόριοι* (Ptolemy, *Geog.* 2. 7, § 9), 'the nation with four armies' (cf. Brugmann, *op. cit.* II. 2, p. 15). C and G are so often confused in capitals that one need not hesitate to read *Tricorios* here.

21. 31, §§ 9-12 and 32, § 6. Livy here tells us that the march from the Island presented no difficulties until Hannibal came to the Druentia, which he found very difficult to cross. From the Druentia his route lay mainly through level country till he reached the Alps. There is something wrong here. Hannibal had crossed the Druentia before reaching the Island. To reach it again he would have to leave the Rhone valley and go up the valley of the Drôme and pass through Gap, the route taken by the Roman road in *Itin. Burdig.* 554-5. He would then reach the Durance at Chorges. But after that, instead of leaving the Durance (*ab Druentia*, 32, § 6), he would follow it to Briançon, and no part of the route after Chorges could be described as *campestre iter* (32, § 6). One would also think he would have found the way from Die to Gap far from easy. Napoleon thought he might have gone from Grenoble through Bourg d'Oisans to Briançon. But that route passes through several very difficult gorges and crosses the high pass of the Lautaret (6,752 feet), and was probably impassable before roads and tunnels were made (see Wilkinson, p. 42, and Murray's *France* II., p. 239). In any case, it could not be described as *nusquam impedita uia*. Mr. G. E. Marindin, *Class. Rev.* XIII. 238 ff., thought he went from Grenoble up the valley of the Drac past Vizille and St. Bonnet, where he would have to cross a pass 4,000 feet above sea-level, and over the Col Bayard (4,088 feet) to Gap. But, to say nothing of the country between Grenoble and La Mure (Laffrey is 2,240 feet above the plain of Grenoble), a route with two such passes could not be described as *nusquam impedita uia*. Moreover each of these three routes leads to the Col du Mont-Genèvre, from which there is no view of the Italian plains. Nor could Hannibal be said to arrive at the Alps on any of

these routes after crossing the Druentia, for he would have been in the Alps long before reaching it. Grenoble is in the Alps. The 'ascent of the Alps' does not mean the ascent to the pass into Italy. Strabo, for instance, describing the road through the Alps by way of Cavaillon, Gap, and Mont Genève, puts 'the beginning of the ascent of the Alps' 63 Roman miles from Tarascon and 99 miles from Embrun (p. 179), which was 29 Roman miles beyond Gap (*Itin. Ant.* 342). Any route then which would take Hannibal to the upper course of the Druentia is as inconsistent with Livy's narrative as with Polybius'. Either Livy has described the crossing of the Druentia at the wrong place in his narrative, as Professor Wilkinson thinks, and this description refers to the crossing of the Druentia near the Rhone before he reached the Island, or else Livy or the authority he followed has made a slip in the name and means the Druna (Ausonius, *Mosella*, 479), now the Drôme.<sup>1</sup> On the whole the most probable explanation is that Livy means the Druentia and has described its crossing in the wrong place, possibly because his authority also mentioned the crossing of the Drôme. That ancient historians should make such blunders is not surprising. Modern writers, with the advantages of good maps and printed texts, make equally glaring mistakes. Strachan-Davidson, *quem honoris causa nomino*, says the Ligurians 'must at the moment have been well disposed towards Rome, for Scipio (Polyb. III. 41. 4) took only five days to march from Pisa to Massilia' (*Selections from Polybius*, p. 187). Strachan-Davidson was a good and careful scholar and a trained historical investigator, yet he has here forgotten three obvious facts: (1) The distance by land would be at least 350 English miles (it is 358 miles by rail from Pisa to Marseilles), and no army could march

that distance in five days; (2) the 'Ligurians' between Monaco and Marseilles were such stubborn fighters and so hostile to Rome that it took the Romans eighty years to open a road through their territory (Strabo, p. 203; this road was built by Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus about 120 B.C.); (3) in the very passage to which he refers, Polybius says explicitly that Scipio went by sea. If such a man as Strachan-Davidson could blunder so grossly, it would be absurd to expect perfect accuracy from Polybius or Livy.

R. L. DUNBABIN.

*University of Tasmania.*

P.S.—When I wrote my notes on Hannibal's route, I had not seen Mr. A. R. Bonus' book *Where Hannibal Passed*. I said (p. 55): 'Each of these three routes leads to the Col du Mont-Genèvre, from which there is no view of the Italian plains.' Mr. Bonus points out that there is a route from Briançon to Italy over a pass which has a good view of the Italian plains, viz. the Col du Malaure (p. 44). But Mr. Bonus has proved too much. His route before reaching the Col du Malaure passes over the Col de Malrif, and the plains of Italy can be seen from it also (p. 54). Now it is clear that in their accounts of the view from the pass, as in most of their statements about Hannibal's march, Livy and Polybius are following the same authority and that it was the narrative of an eyewitness, who was probably Silenus, for Polybius dismisses Sosylus with contempt (3. 20, § 5). Mr. Bonus says there was no view at all from his last pass because it had snowed heavily overnight (p. 46). But how does Mr. Bonus know that the snow fell the night before Hannibal began the descent? Neither Livy nor Polybius says so. It is clear that there was a view, and that it had a great psychological effect. That effect would have been lost if the army had already seen the plains from a pass which did not lead down into them. It is unnecessary to point out the many other points at which Mr. Bonus is contradicted by the plain statements of Livy and Polybius. It is sufficient to say that his theory as to Hannibal's march is based on the

<sup>1</sup> Where the P.L.M. railway crosses them, the Durance has a broad bed, most of it sand-banks or silt; the Drôme is not wide, but has a broad, shingly bed (cf. 'saxa glareosa uolvens,' c. 31, § 11). But Ausonius' *sparsis incerta Druentia ripis* (*Mosella*, 479) corresponds to the rest of Livy's description. So in all likelihood the river really was the Druentia.

assumption that Chapter XXXIX. of Polybius Book III. is an interpolation. One of his reasons for this remarkable position is that 'it speaks of Narbonne not as a river . . . but as a fixed point or town' (p. 2). But the clause in which Narbonne is a town is not in the MSS. of Polybius but was added by M. C. P. Schmidt in a vain attempt to correct Polybius' arithmetic. So we may dismiss Mr. Bonus and his passes.

I have said (p. 56, n.) that at the point where the P.L.M. railway crosses the Durance the river-bed consists chiefly of sand-banks and silt. This was what I thought I saw from the train in 1927. But Murray's *France*, Part II., p. 138 (1892), says: 'The Durance here presents a broad bed of gravel, not a quarter of which is occupied by the river, except in times of flood.'

R. L. D.

## REVIEWS

### ANCIENT ATHLETICS.

*Athletics of the Ancient World.* By E. NORMAN GARDINER, D.Litt. Pp. x+246; 216 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1930. Cloth, 28s.

ATHLETIC sports played such an important part in the education and life of the Greeks that this thoroughly scholarly and comprehensive account of their history and practice should be of great value to all students of the classics as well as to all who are interested in athletics for their own sake. As most of our knowledge is derived from representations of athletes in Greek art, especially in vase-paintings, the large number of illustrations is particularly useful and interesting. They are conveniently arranged in groups so that reference to them is easy; and the inclusion of several photographs of modern athletes in action and of athletic bronzes by Dr. Tait McKenzie serves to show how closely in many points modern athletic technique follows the Greek.

The chapters dealing with the history of ancient athletics could hardly have been done better. A preliminary discussion on the evidence for sporting activities in ancient eastern civilisations leads inevitably to the conclusion that it was only the Greeks who had any conception of a 'sporting spirit.' It is then shown that athletics were, in the first instance, a physical necessity for the Greeks, who had to keep themselves fit for the perpetual warfare in which they indulged, but that the love of competition, which is akin to the love of

battle, was a national characteristic and influenced their practice of athletics from the earliest times. Even in the days of the Homeric heroes athletics were obviously in an advanced state of development, and specialisation was taken for granted. Very early in Greek athletic history this tendency towards specialisation caused trouble, and by the beginning of the fifth century the sport was being ruined by semi-professional athletes who made it their business and apparently prospered in their profession. The authorities at Olympia and at the other great festivals strove hard to prevent the spread of corrupt influences and practices, and were remarkably successful; but their good work was undone by the increasing interest which the various states of the Greek world took in athletic prestige, and the immense rewards which they lavished upon those of their countrymen who returned home victorious. The artificial stimulus given to the festivals by Roman influence and wealth eventually destroyed amateur athletics in Greece, but the truly amateur spirit flourished for a time further eastward, where local festivals took the place of the great games. In spite of the rise of professionalism, however, the chief festivals were not abandoned until the pagan religion with which they were associated was finally abolished by imperial decrees at the close of the fourth century A.D.; and in the east the local festivals lingered on until the sixth century.

The chapters on the training and technique of Greek athletics show not only that Dr. Gardiner had an extensive knowledge of the evidence for ancient practice, but that he had studied carefully the details of modern athletics, and was therefore able to make judicious and interesting comparisons which often strikingly confirm his interpretation of the ancient evidence. There are, however, a few technical points on which I should venture to disagree with him, particularly on the question of discus-throwing. In his account of this event the author was misled, I believe, by his knowledge of the peculiar American style of throwing, and he asserts that 'the modern free style unfortunately has abandoned the principle of the Greek throw.' The actual throw is based on exactly the same principle as the Greek throw, but this fact is far less evident in the American than in the more usual Scandinavian style. The American athlete in the backward swing of the discus bends his arm behind his back as soon as his hand has passed his body, while all other athletes swing the discus further backwards and upwards, almost exactly in the manner used by the athlete depicted on a Panathenaic amphora of the late fifth century (p. 165). The discus is here swung upwards higher than the head, and the hand holding it is turned outwards, while the hand of Myron's discobolus is turned inwards. This turn of the hand indicates a considerable variation in style, and is not, as Dr. Gardiner suggests, merely a matter of preference; it cannot be compared with the practice of modern athletes. The fact is that, if the discus is not to fall out of the hand, it is physically impossible to swing it back and up beyond a certain point without turning the hand outwards. Myron's discobolus has swung the discus as far back as he could without turning his hand. He is presumably using a straight backwards-and-forwards swing because he is throwing a heavier discus (the Greek disci that have been found vary in weight from 3 to 15 pounds), and if he were to

swing it up or round any further the strain on his arm would be too great and he would lose control of his implement. The figure on the Panathenaic amphora is using a lighter discus, probably—to judge from its size—of about the same weight as those used by modern athletes ( $4\frac{1}{2}$  pounds), and so can use a longer and more vigorous swing. On the question of accuracy in throwing Dr. Gardiner is hardly fair to the modern athlete. Under both Greek and modern conditions the limitations as to direction are purely nominal, and competitions take place without difficulty in the restored stadium at Athens, and could easily be held even in the smaller stadium at Delphi.

One small point about the Greek stadium. It is not difficult to explain the object of the grooves in the stone sills which form the starting line. By placing his toes in them a runner can get a much better start than he could from a plain stone foothold, even at Delphi, where they are only  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches apart. The sills themselves were made of stone presumably so that starting conditions should be the same for all competitors, whatever the state of the ground or weather.

The chapters on boxing, wrestling, and the pancratium are admirable. Many obscure points about the pancratium in particular are cleared up, and it is shown to have been something more than a mere combination of boxing and wrestling and to have had definite rules and conditions of its own which made it unlike either and superior to both as a test of skill and stamina.

The whole book presents a delightful and authoritative account of its subject, and it is only on a few minor technical points that any fault can be found with it. There are no misprints of any importance, but the armed runner in Fig. 24 must have lost his shield from his left and not his right arm (*cf.* the text, p. 135).

R. L. HOWLAND.

*St. John's College,  
Cambridge.*



## 'BRIEF MENTION.'

*Selections from the 'Brief Mention' of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve.* Edited with a biographical sketch and an index by C. W. E. MILLER. Pp. liii+493; portrait. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 21s. net.

TOWARDS the end of last century, and in the early years of this, 'Brief Mention' by B. L. G. in the *A.J.P.* was running to all lengths. A scholar of high repute sat in monthly judgment upon scholars, ever harking back to what he had heard as a Gelbschnabel in Berlin or in Bonn, to what he had written long ago, to his Pindar. If his style was taxed with ψυχρότης, he would answer with smothered heat: his critics had forgotten their Dickens, or their Scott, or his Pindar. If his irony outwitted them, as when for the nonce he seemed to defer to Jebb's 'cool radiance' on a passage of his Pindar, the next 'Brief Mention' would make a long nose. The *tertius gaudens* found it fun for a while, but then it palled. When I decried it, a common friend, my near neighbour, bade me remember that Gildersleeve bore a wound from the war of North and South. But there must have been some rankling wounds of his spirit as well. Yet in this year, the hundredth since his birth, the seventh since his death, 'Brief Mentions' can be read in bulk: their self-revelation has taken on some of the glamour that attaches to Pepys.

English scholars will find much in this book that is of local interest to them. It seems that in the heyday of 'Brief Mention' we took our classics sadly and solemnly, except when we so

far forgot ourselves as to indulge in 'classroom funniments' about his Pindar. We were cocky about quantities, but on syntax we were culpably weak. The Scots were as like unto us as porridge to plum-pudding. As for the Irishry, had not a pair of the spalpeens translated εἶπόμεν by 'I said'?

But Britishers need no Candid Friend to teach them each other's shortcomings. If Gildersleeve had known us better he would have known us worse. What we and the rest have to learn from this book is not about ourselves but about Greek, about poetry, about literature; for the veteran scholar was a great knower of these things. The form of the book, an undigested selection from the miscellaneous, might be thought bad, were it not saved by a very full index, the work of his colleague and successor, who contributes also a biography, and a list of publications that ranges from 1843 to 1922. The principle of choice, described in the preface, leaves room for the hope that a volume of good long brevities on syntax may follow. All that Gildersleeve wrote was fresh and vigorous, but it was on syntax that he was best.

A little word seems to have slipped in on p. 293: 'but a bibliography is needful and what an American editor . . . would dare to pen a sentence like this in which Mr. Mooney dismisses the subject of "literature" . . .?' P. 311: 'Cauer . . . is in the field. Ilberg tarries by the stuff. To judge by my own experience the man in the field is the happier': here lurks a Teutonism.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

## LIDDELL AND SCOTT, PART 5.

*A Greek-English Lexicon.* Compiled by H. G. LIDDELL and R. SCOTT. A new edition . . . by H. STUART JONES and R. MCKENZIE. Part 5: *θησαν-ροποιέω—κώψ*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930. Paper, 10s. 6d.

COMPARING this part of the new edition with my notes on the old, I find im-

provements under θοινάτωρ, θυγατριδῆ, θυμέλη, ἱερός, ἰοπλοκ-, ἰσωνία, καταπακτός, κατεκλύω, κελεύω (III.), κέντημα, κρυπτεύω, κύμινον, κομωδός, and lastly κώψ, which the old edition left meaningless and forlorn. These are doubtless but few among many words that have gained.

ἰάομαι, ἰατρός, etc. The notes on quantity suggest that ἰ is rare in tragedy, ἱ in comedy: but Euripides has more ἰ than ἱ (*Hip.* 296, 597, [*Sup.* 252], *Tro.* 1233, *fr.* 917, 1072, 1086), and Aristophanes has ἰ at least thrice.

ἰπνός need not mean *lantern* in *Ar. Pax* 841, *Pl.* 815.

ἰππαπαί, 'a cry of the Ἴππείδς, a parody of the boatman's cry, *Ar. Eq.* 602.' No: a cry of the ἵπποι.

ἰσχάς. Justice is not done to *Anth. Plan.* 240, 241.

ἴτριον. The first vowel might safely be marked long.

καθίστημι, *B.* 7. *And.* 2. 11 is now quoted aright: but then what need of the special meaning *cost*? The words can mean 'more than the price at which they became mine.'

καλλονή is used by Plato, to be sure, but in a personification.

καταπρακώ. *In rags* is misleading

for *κατεπρακωμένος*, *S. Tr.* 1103: it is the speaker's *body* that is tattered.

κινέω is enriched with a new meaning (*II.* 4), tempered by a doubt between κ- and β-. Under *II.* 5, add references to πάντα κ. πέτρον (and λίθον).

κίσηρις. The form κίσηλις, which I had inferred from *Luc. Jud. Voc.* 4, has turned up in a papyrus, it appears.

κλησίς is concrete, *bond*, in *Th.* 7. 70. κοινεών now has its due place.

κόλλα. Add *Eur. fr.* 472.

κόλπος, *III.* 2, *bay, gulf*, does not suffice, for in some of the passages cited the word denotes the *land* round a gulf.

κτάομαι, *II.* 2. A bad mistake over *S. Ph.* 778 has gone.

Is one to bind up *Parts* 1-5? Nothing is said about 'publisher's covers,' and the lists of *Addenda* and *Corrigenda* are still in the rough.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

## THE HISTORY OF GREEK.

*Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue grecque.*

By A. MEILLET. Third edition.

Pp. 326. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1930.

IN the third edition, completely revised and augmented, of Meillet's book, which was originally published in 1913, full consideration has been given to the advance in Greek linguistics which has been made since that time. The impression which it leaves on the reader is still that it is rather disconnected, but this is doubtless due to the nature of the task before the author and could have been overcome, if at all, only by recasting the whole book. Meillet divides his subject into three parts, containing respectively the prehistory of Greek, the literary languages, and the *koine*. In the first part he discusses the structure of Greek, its Indo-European origins, its relation to neighbouring languages, and its separation into dialects. It is a pity that considerations of space prevent him from discussing more fully the connexion between Greek as we know it and the neighbouring non-Greek languages, especially those of Asia Minor, and that excessive caution should restrain him

from tackling more fully the difficult but interesting problems of personal and place names. Chapter IV., which deals with the dialects, is excellent.

The second part treats of the various literary dialects in twelve chapters, and of these the sixth and the seventh, on the language of Homer and the development of the article, are particularly good. In the fourth he reaffirms his belief in the Indo-European origin of the metre of Aeolic poetry, connecting it with that of the Veda and Avesta, but he is not convincing. In the other chapters he gives short but good accounts of the language of lyric, tragedy, comedy, and prose, the best being that on Pindar and the choral lyricists.

The whole of the third section is excellent, and provides a complete lesson in the growth and decay of language. Meillet discusses the historical conditions under which a common language can arise, the sources of our knowledge of the *koine*, its linguistic features, its dialectal origins, its establishment and dissolution, and the development of a new *koine*. The exposition is very good indeed.



This book should be in the hands of every student and teacher of Greek, and indeed of everyone interested in Indo-European linguistics. There are very

few misprints and these unimportant, there is a good bibliography, but it is to be regretted that there is no index.

University of Leeds.

P. S. NOBLE.

### A HISTORY OF GREEK TRAGEDY.

*Die griechische Tragödie.* By MAX POHLENZ. Vol. I., pp. viii. + 542; Vol. II., iv. + 148. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Paper, M. 18 and 10 (bound, 20 and 12).

IT is a pleasure to welcome this latest history of Greek Tragedy, distinguished as it is not only by learning and accuracy, but by an insight into Greek thought and feeling which is too true to accept conventional statements when they are based on modern rather than ancient ideas, and which, even when such statements are sound, constantly puts them in a fresh and interesting light. This is, in fact, what would be expected by those who are familiar with the author's earlier work on Greek political ideas, and his essays on the Greek Drama itself in various periodicals.

The first of the two volumes contains the continuous history, the second a series of very valuable notes, not only on questions of literary history and appreciation, but also on the text or interpretation of important passages in many of the plays which are discussed. Future editors of plays will do well not to neglect these notes, in some of which, so far as I can judge, we have the final solution of one vexed question or another.

It need not be said that the author is thoroughly familiar with the work of his predecessors in the same field, and he is generous in his appraisal of it. Though he is not under the spell of any single writer, he has evidently made great use, as every serious student must, of the writings of U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf; but he often differs from him and gives good reasons for the difference. He frequently cites also the fine, though immature, work on Sophocles of Tycho von Wilamowitz, whose death in the War was a sad loss to scholarship, and Schadewaldt's useful *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, though he is proof against the wild interpretations

of a number of tragedies offered by Schadewaldt and some others; and he shows an unusual acquaintance, for a Continental writer, with the works of British scholars. (It is regrettable that there is no reference to Walter Headlam's interpretation of the *finale* of the *Eumenides*—one of the very few great scenes to which the author perhaps scarcely does justice.) The courtesy with which the author everywhere treats those who differ from him affords an admirable example of good manners in controversy.

The history begins with a discussion (fortunately short) on the Origins of Tragedy. The author's view is conservative, and rests, first, on the literal acceptance of the statements made by Aristotle, and, secondly, on the hypothesis of the existence of rival Peripatetic and Alexandrian theories, the latter being responsible for inventing the derivation from Phlius of a Satyric Drama, distinct from Tragedy. I have my doubts, but there is no need to argue the matter again here; and on a question about which certainty is at present impossible, I should be quite contented if some new evidence proved that Pohlenz was right.

The book offers a very satisfying treatment of nearly all aspects of Greek Tragedy. The difficult problems of stage-presentation are not indeed fully discussed; but where the author does refer to them (as he does with reference to the *Prometheus*, the *Eumenides* and the *Ajax*) his judgment is thoroughly sane. He is at his best in the elucidation of the religious meaning of the drama, and of its close relation to the political conditions and the popular feeling of each successive generation or decade, and to the reaction of these upon the minds of the poets. No one, so far as I know, has shown so clearly how closely almost every play was in touch with the 'real

life' of its time. The author's criticism (in the last section of the book) upon Aristotle's attitude to the drama is to the effect that Aristotle forgot that the tragedy of the fifth century was both *Gottesdienst* and *Volksdienst*, and assumed that Greek Tragedy was intended to appeal to the individual as such. Pohlenz himself makes no such mistake; time after time, in reading his paragraphs on these subjects, I feel that what he says is exactly right and could not have been better said; and on the political side, even more than on the religious, there is much in the book that is as fresh as it is convincing. The intimate connexion of Euripides' development with the political vicissitudes of his times is particularly well drawn out, and only at one or two points becomes, it may be, a little fanciful (e.g. in the treatment of the *Iphigeneia in Aulis*). The cardinal chapter of the book is that which deals with Individuality and State in the Periclean Age; both the religious and the political characteristics of post-Aeschylean tragedy are connected with the growth of individualism, and the critical spirit which accompanied it, so that for Euripides the myths become the setting for very human studies of character, or merely the starting-point for free invention on the part of the poet. (See especially the section on the Secularisation of Tragedy.) The author also reaches the highest level in his analysis of character and motives, and at times reminds me of the work of Dr. Andrew Bradley on the characters of Shakespeare (I can think of no higher praise).

Each play receives separate and sufficiently full consideration, and a number of the more interesting of

those plays which are only represented by fragments are also discussed. It is difficult to select particular instances when all is so good: but the treatment of the *Helena* is especially illuminating, and its connexion in spirit with the famous *δισσοὶ λόγοι* is well brought out. The dramatic technique of the *Ajax*, and the meaning of the *Bacchae*, are the subjects of some of the best work in the book.

A few points of interest may be noted. The place of Phrynichus in the development of tragedy is carefully estimated. The *Πυρφόρος* is taken to be the first play in the Trilogv of Prometheus. The final scene of the *Septem* is rejected. The author insists (perhaps too strongly) that there is no question in the *Antigone* of a conflict with the authority of the State. The relation between some scenes in tragedy and the *Helena* of Gorgias, and the place of this work in the history of Greek criticism are well discussed. Strong reasons are given against the Euripidean authorship of the *Rhesus*. On some of these points it is possible to disagree, but not without finding reasons as good as or better than the author gives.

It is impossible, in a brief review, to do more than record general impressions; but I may sum these up by saying that this work, taken as a whole, seems to me to come nearer than any other known to me in its sanity, its insight, its warmth and truthfulness of appreciation to being an ideal history of Greek Tragedy. It is, moreover, very readable, and it will be disappointing if it does not find an English translator who will do justice to its style as well as to its matter.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

*University of Sheffield.*

#### THE BUDÉ ARISTOPHANES, VOLUME V.

*Aristophane, L'Assemblée des Femmes, Ploutos.* With a Greek text by V. COULON, and translation into French by H. VAN DAELE. Pp. 147. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres.' 1930. Paper, 30 fr.

WITH the publication of this volume containing the *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus* the

Budé edition of Aristophanes is complete. In it M. van Daele provides the general reader with a convenient and trustworthy translation, with stage directions and short but adequate explanatory notes, while M. Coulon provides the specialist with a text constructed throughout with care and judgment.

As I have remarked in reviewing the earlier volumes in this Journal, I could wish that Coulon had justified his elaborate critical apparatus by a fresh collation of some of the minor manuscripts. I could also wish that he had not inserted some of his own emendations in the text. The text of Aristophanes offers only a very restricted field for emendation. It has been sifted for so many centuries by first-class minds that all the major emendations have already been made. To take an instance: If Coulon's κῶλά θ' ἰζομένας in *Eccl.* 23 for the corrupt κωλαθιζομένας had been worth making it would have been made long ago. The emendations that are still possible are of the type of Richards's κατορθώσασι for κατορθώσασα in 172, where the scribes have blurred an idiom that they did not understand. Another criticism that I should make on the text is that Coulon seems to me too prone to accept emendations that normalise constructions, often, I think, at the expense of conversational idiom. E.g. *Eccl.* 927 τί γὰρ ἂν γραῖ καινά τις λέγοι, where he reads καινόν with Blaydes. But τί is regularly used in conversational Attic with a neuter plural that may be considered as a unit. Similarly in *Eccl.* 172 ἰδὼν ἐπειθόμενῃ it is easy to insert ἂν with Brunck, but we not only get a doubtful anapaest but

also probably destroy a proverbial phrase, 'seeing is believing,' thrown into the past. 'I've always been in the habit of believing what I saw' (v. Kühner-Gerth, i. p. 216).

I note a few small points which have struck me in reading the volume. Is 'comment cela' or 'comment donc' quite strong enough for πόθεν in the sense of 'nonsense!' (πόθεν ἀρρηγικόν, ἴσον τῷ οὐδαμῶς Suid.), and is αὐτίκα γάρ ('for instance') in *Pl.* 130 quite 'tout de suite tenez'? In *Eccl.* 595 what ground is there for finding a reference to death in κατέδει πέλεθον πρότερός μου? Von Velsen's explanation seems much more probable. In *Eccl.* 47 Cobet's emendation καί τοι for καί μοι seems to me to distort the whole passage. Σπείδουσαν must be a comic inversion, since it is impossible to 'hurry' when wearing ἐμβάδες. You were much more likely to 'swim' in them (*Eq.* 321 ἔνεον ἐν ταῖς ἐμβάσιν). Melistichē is trudging along in her husband's shoes, which are far too large—the other women get along faster since they are carrying theirs—but as she has had time to put them on she can't have had any difficulty, as the others had, in getting away from her husband (κατὰ σχολὴν ἐξήλθε).

F. W. HALL.

St. John's College,  
Oxford.

#### A FRENCH EDITION OF ANDOCIDES.

*Andocide, Discours.* Texte établi et traduit par GEORGES DALMEYDA. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 25 fr.

At least forty years had passed since an annotated edition of any part of Andocides had appeared. Much had been written about him in the interval, and the time was ripe for a new and comprehensive edition. Professor Dalmeyda has produced a very good one, sufficiently well documented to provide in a convenient form all the help that anyone interested in Andocides can want. The spurious κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου is included: it is not of much importance to anybody, but the editor has some interesting things to say about it.

The general introduction begins with a concise account of all that is known of the orator's adventurous life. Of course his final banishment after his abortive peace negotiations of 392/1—formerly regarded as fiction, but established as fact by the fragments of Didymus' commentary on Demosthenes—is duly recorded. The estimate of Andocides' shifty character is, I think, charitable. So far as we can judge, Andocides was in every respect a second-rate person, save only when he was displaying his gifts as a liar: in ingenious perversion of the truth he was consummate. The more noteworthy merits and defects of his oratory are succinctly enumerated and illustrated; and the introduction concludes with a useful

section on the manuscripts, which are bad, and the state of the text, which is deplorable.

The editor agrees with Blass that the *κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου* is a specimen of the numerous sophistic compositions for which, already in the early years of the fourth century B.C., the escapades attributed to Alcibiades provided material. He is inclined to place the date between 396 and 380 B.C.—the dates of Isocrates' *De Bigis* and *Panegyricus* respectively. But is it probable that anyone writing so early could have made such a muddle of the proceedings connected with ostracism, or could have committed himself to such glaring errors of fact? Jebb's opinion (*Attic Orators* I, 139) that the speech is the work of a late rhetorician 'who had only an indistinct notion of how ostracism was managed in olden times; and who believed himself sufficiently prepared for his task when he had read in Plutarch all the scandalous stories relating to Alcibiades' seems more probable.

There are a great many places in which the text defies restoration. Professor Dalmeyda has wisely printed a readable version. He has introduced a few conjectures of his own; but I do not think that any one of them is certain. Thus at *De Mystериis* § 4 he reads γῇ δεδομένη δωρεὰ ὑπάρχουσα (ἢ δίδομένη καὶ δωρεὰ ὑ. MSS.): but this is not better than previous conjectures. At § 82 δοκιμάσαντες πάντας τοὺς νόμους εἴτ' ἀναγράφαι . . . τούτους τῶν νόμων οἱ ἂν δοκιμασθῶσι, he has

inserted αἰεὶ before the last word, remarking 'quod ni facias, verbum δοκιμάζειν vix eodem sensu intellexeris.' But that δοκιμασθῶσι, even with αἰεὶ, must mean 'have been approved,' not merely 'revised,' is proved by the corresponding words in § 84, τοὺς κυρουμένους τῶν νόμων ἀναγράφαι. The verb is no doubt awkwardly used in two different senses: we have a piece of carelessness on the orator's part quite in keeping with others that disfigure his style.

Occasionally the text and the translation are in conflict. At § 2 of the *De Mystериis* καὶ before πρῶτον μὲν is bracketed—wrongly, with Baiter—but is translated. At § 85 the text has πάντες, but the translation and the note (p. 137) assume πάντως (Blass); and in the decree just above 'après qu'ils auront prêté serment' translates Dobree's ἐπειδὴν ὁμωμόκωσιν, whereas the text has the impossible ἐπειδὴ ὁμωμόκασιν (MSS). Similarly in the *κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου* § 7: text ἀκούσαντες γὰρ <περί> ἐκάστου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων: translation 'car si vous écoutez chacun de ceux qui sont ici prêts à vous instruire,' which disregards Reiske's rather attractive but unconvincing περί.

A reference to Sandys' note on Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* c. 57, § 3 would help at § 78 of the *De Mystериis* ἢ ἐπὶ πρυτανείου ἢ Δελφινίου, and τυραννείν ἐπαναστῇ at § 97 might be defended against Dobree by a reference to *Ath. Pol.* c. 16, § 10.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

#### FRIEDLÄNDER ON PLATO.

Platon. II. Die platonischen Schriften.

Von P. FRIEDLÄNDER. Pp. 690.

Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter.

Paper, RM. 38 (bound, 40).

MR. FRIEDLÄNDER'S volume *Platon, Eidos, Paideia, Dialogos*, was heartily commended to readers of the *Classical Review* on its appearance in 1928; it is a pleasant duty to commend no less heartily its successor, in which the general interpretation of the Platonic philosophy formerly given is reinforced by an able, subtle, and elaborate study of the arguments of the dialogues taken

seriatim, from the *Protagoras* to the *Laws*. The author's list of genuine dialogues includes, in addition to those universally, or all but universally, recognised, the *Hipparchus* and *Theages*, which are included among the 'aporetic' dialogues, and the *Alcibiades* I, placed along with the *Gorgias* and *Meno* in a group immediately preceding the great constructive works, *Symposium*, *Phaedo*, *Republic*. (The rehabilitation of *Theages* and *Alcibiades* had already been promised in the author's first volume.) Mr. Fried-



länder's defence of the three dialogues, especially of the *Alcibiades*, is throughout thoroughly able, though he would probably hardly claim that it is absolutely convincing. For my own part, I should agree with him entirely on the Platonic character of the contents of both *Alcibiades* and *Hipparchus*; I am not equally satisfied in the case of the *Theages*, where there do seem to me to be coincidences with the *Theaetetus* and *Apology* which read much more like quotations than parallel passages from the hand of the same author. I should also admit that there is nothing in the linguistic character of any of the three works inconsistent with Platonic authorship. And yet I confess I do not find my doubts silenced by these considerations. If I were persuaded by the defence of them, I think I should feel bound, on the same grounds, to admit Platonic authorship for at least the *Minos*, and probably the *Clitophon*, and I doubt whether anything in the 'canon of Thrasyllus' could really be excluded, except the *Alcibiades* II. And I should certainly hold that it is *a fortiori* quite impossible to acquiesce, as Mr. Friedländer does without discussion, in the ascription of the *Epinomis* to Philippus of Opus. As to the *Theages*, I still feel that it treats the Socratic 'divine sign' much more seriously than any certainly genuine Platonic work, in fact that, like Mr. Friedländer himself, in his first volume, it exaggerates what our German friends call the 'daemonic' in the personality of Socrates in a fashion which is not quite that of Plato. I should be very willing to be persuaded of the genuineness of the other two, and any one who has read the appendix in the third edition of my own *Plato* will know that I, at least, have fully recognised the ironical character of the eulogium on Hipparchus and the account given in the *Alcibiades* of the 'education' of a Persian king. Yet I still feel that the numerous coincidences of the *Alcibiades* with several Platonic dialogues are more like deliberate citations than anything else, and that the assertion about the enormous wealth of Sparta can hardly be part of the 'irony' of a Plato. They seem to me to reveal a writer who is thinking of

the position of Sparta between Aegospotami and Leuctra. And there is the problem, not considered by Mr. Friedländer, whether the dialogue is not visibly dependent on the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines, and whether such dependence is credible in Plato. Also, in spite of Mr. Friedländer's courteous rebuke, I still feel that the *Alcibiades* of the *Protagoras* and *Symposium* is a living figure, he of the *Alcibiades* I a mere type, like those of the New Comedy. Mr. Friedländer's most telling point is perhaps his argument that the literary style of all three dialogues is that of the age of Plato, not of the time of Xenocrates. But is not the answer to this simple? It amounts only to proof that Xenocrates, or a man like Xenocrates, could not have written *Hipparchus* or *Alcibiades*. This is no proof that no member of the Academy of the same period as Xenocrates could have written them, as presumably some such persons, on Mr. Friedländer's own hypothesis, wrote the *Amatores* and the *Clitophon*. In any case, demonstration either way seems to be out of the question, and I do not dispute the legitimacy of using *Alcibiades* I as an excellent source for the moral doctrine of ἐπιμέλεια ἑαυτοῦ.

Mr. Friedländer's views on the order of the dialogues, given in a concluding chapter, are markedly sane. In the matter of 'linguistic statistics' he follows von Arnim, and makes much more moderate claims for 'stylometry' than some of its more enthusiastic devotees. In particular, he rightly observes that it would be impossible to be sure that chronological groups constituted by the appeal to 'stylometry' may not overlap, and also that the method cannot be trusted to establish an absolute order among works all belonging to the same 'group.' Hence the actual order in which the dialogues are treated in the volume is not assumed to be in detail that of their composition. The choice of the *Protagoras* to open the examination, we are warned, must not be taken to imply that the *Protagoras* was written before the *Laches* or *Charmides*. The general result is to discriminate dialogues presumably earlier than the great central triad, *Symposium*, *Phaedo*, *Republic*, into four

groups: (1) 'aporetic' dialogues, concerned with a quest, which ostensibly fails, for a definition (*Protagoras* to *Greater Hippias*), (2) early dialogues in which the philosopher is contrasted with sophist and poet (*Hipparchus*, *Ion*, *Lesser Hippias*, *Theages*), (3) *Selbstdarstellungen* of the philosopher (*Apology* group, *Euthydemus*, *Cratylus*, *Menexenus*), (4) dialogues in which the λόγος 'comes to rest' in a definite result (*Alcibiades I*, *Gorgias*, *Meno*).

One readily recognises that this arrangement gives a real logical grouping. But can one feel confident that it need be even as near an approximation to a chronological order as the moderate claims of the author for 'stylometry' suggest? The question is raised in an acute form by Mr. Friedländer's acceptance of the view that *Republic I* originally existed as an independent 'aporetic' dialogue (the *Thrasymachus*). The proof offered does not impress me strongly. In fact I do not see how philological considerations could possibly prove more than that *Rep. I* stands nearer than later parts of the *Republic* to the 'aporetic' dialogues. This nearness might be, but need not be, due to temporal propinquity in order of composition. It might equally be due to Plato's desire, for artistic reasons, to open his great work with an 'aporetic' conversation. And it is instructive to find that the alleged specially close parallel of *Rep. I* with *Laches*, *Charmides*, etc., can only be made out by introducing further arbitrary assumptions that the supposed early *Thrasymachus* has been both interpolated and curtailed of its conclusion to make it fit its present place. It seems to me rash therefore to assert that any such dialogue was ever in circulation. Whether or not Plato constructed the prologue to his *Republic* out of 'unpublished' material from his 'private papers' is a different question, and I do not see that we have sufficient evidence to decide it.

There is a passage at the very end of Mr. Friedländer's book which, I think, illustrates admirably the sort of really insoluble problem which we must not attempt to determine with certainty. The question is raised whether any of

the dialogues were written during the lifetime of Socrates. Mr. Friedländer properly refuses to dogmatise, but inclines to the affirmative, apparently on the ground that the alternative view would require us to make the *Apology* and its companions Plato's earliest work, and this, for sound reasons, he regards as impossible. Thus, the psychological assumption is made that if Plato were first moved to become a writer of Socratic discourses after the death of his master, he could have been in none but a tragic mood. But is the psychology here assumed sound? Is it not psychologically equally possible that Plato's thoughts would dwell by preference, in the time immediately after the death of Socrates, on memories of him from better days? The one possibility seems to me as real as the other, and hence the priority of works like the *Laches* and *Lesser Hippias* to the *Apology* and *Crito* appears to prove nothing as to the circumstances in which Plato began to write.

It would be superfluous for me to praise Mr. Friedländer's admirable summaries of the various dialogues in detail. I may make a general observation or two, perhaps, upon certain characteristics of the treatment. On the question of the degree of unity of Plato's thought Mr. Friedländer stands much nearer to Professor Shorey than to those who draw a marked distinction between an earlier and a later Platonic doctrine, and he devotes a great deal of skill and subtlety to the task of discovering the main outline of Platonic doctrine in all dialogues from the *Gorgias* on. This is valuable work, and ought certainly to be pondered very carefully by interpreters whose own bias is to distinguish the later Plato from the earlier. But I cannot help wondering whether some of the skilful pleading undertaken to show, apparently, that Plato already had all the logic of the *Sophistes* in his head when he wrote the *Republic* is not ingenious rather than convincing, and I would respectfully submit to both him and Professor Shorey that it is perhaps not the highest compliment to Plato to think of him as a Bourbon of the intellect, incapable of learning or forgetting. I also think



Mr. Friedländer tends a little in this volume, as in its precursor, to use one or two favourite words, Eidos, for example, and Logos, as though they were in themselves explanations. The most striking illustration of this is afforded by the remarks made in the chapter on the *Sophistes* about the εἰδὼν φίλοι of that dialogue. Mr. Friedländer is convinced that they are the representatives of Plato's own position, though he has nothing better to offer in explanation of the apparent refutation of them than a comparison of the Platonic doctrine of the *Eidos* with the παλίντονος ἁρμονίη of Heraclitus—a comparison which surely explains nothing. I note that he rejects the explanation of Proclus, that the εἰδὼν φίλοι means 'philosophers of Italy,' as a mere unwarranted inference from the *Sophistes* passage itself. It may be simply an inference from that passage, though I believe Burnet was right when he said that it is not the merely personal inference of Proclus. In view of the known practice of Proclus, I do not believe that he would have given the identification without alternative or discussion, if he had not regarded it as generally accepted. But the inference, if it is an inference, should hardly be treated as baseless. It has a real support in the observation of the Eleatic speaker that Theaetetus at Athens is not likely to have met any of the men spoken of, whereas the speaker himself knows them διὰ συνήθειαν. These words, of which Mr. Friedländer takes no notice, are surely very hard to reconcile with the view that the persons meant are Plato and his circle.

The one place where I feel fairly sure that Mr. Friedländer is mistaken in rejecting a view of my own is in the discussion of the *Politicus* where he 'turns down' my statement that the dialogue is concerned with the practical superiority of constitutionalism over 'personal rule' as a prejudice born of attachment to 'English institutions.' Right or wrong, the statement was not dictated by zeal for the British constitution, but by attention to the actual text of the dialogue and of the fourth book of the *Laws*. And I do not believe that it really differs very much, except

in the matter of relative emphasis, from what Mr. Friedländer himself says. The difference between us, I believe, is only that he thinks Plato most specially anxious to lay stress on the inferiority of even the best government men can actually devise to the rule of an ideal philosopher king. I think Plato was perhaps more immediately concerned with the practical question: seeing that the philosopher king is not to be expected in the working world, what is the most satisfactory substitute for him? Disagreements on points like this are trivial by comparison with the very large measure of agreement I am happy to find between us on much more fundamental matters, such as the primacy in Plato's thought of the practical problems of the end of life and the true method of education and the impossibility of packing the 'theory of Forms' into a metaphysical or epistemological formula.

I think, if I may be allowed to illustrate Mr. Friedländer's position by a contrast with my own, that the main point of real difference between us is that Mr. Friedländer makes the dialogues to be more absolutely dominated by the figure of Socrates than I could do. Even in the *Sophistes* and *Politicus*, where Socrates says nothing, he insists that he dominates the whole situation: the supreme significance of both dialogues is that Socrates is listening to the conversation, and we are to understand that he is, in person, both the genuine philosopher who is discriminated in the first from the sophist, and the ideal kingly man whom the second distinguishes from all rivals. I cannot but feel that to reason thus is to get even more meaning out of the presence of a κωφὸν πρόσωπον than Sheridan extracted from Burleigh's nod. Socrates, in these dialogues, which have no stage directions, does not even nod, and I do not see how to explain his silence, except by the supposition that Plato himself felt that the dialogues are not 'Socratic' in a sense in which even the *Republic* was so. I should add that this all-dominating Socrates, as conceived by Mr. Friedländer, is a symbol rather than a person. He is the symbol of *docta ignorantia* and *liebende Paideia*.

Mr. Friedländer is anxious that we should not take him for the 'historical Socrates.' Plato, he says, never chronicles *das nur historische*. I am not sure how we are supposed to be certified of this, and I think Mr. Friedländer's denial occasionally makes him tend a little towards that resolving of the *mise-en-scène* of the dialogues into obscure symbolism which Proclus carries to such strange lengths in his commentary on the *Parmenides*. E.g., why should it be suggested that the reason why Socrates is found in the *Lysis* walking from the Academy towards the Lyceum is anything more recondite than the fact that Socrates did divide much of his time between these two haunts? As Burnet has said, but for Plato's dialogues we should know as good as nothing of Socrates and the whole intellectual life of Periclean Athens. This being so, I cannot conceive why it should be supposed out of keeping with the character of Plato to find one motive for his writing in the desire to construct a living memorial of a great man and a great age which, without him, would

have been little more than names to subsequent generations.

There are a great many interesting notes on points of textual detail scattered throughout the volume. If one does not feel that the author is always right about the readings he condemns or proposes, he always has something well worth study to say. To us in Great Britain his comments will not be the less valuable that they are largely made up of strictures on Burnet's text. I think I may take the opportunity to remark that, more particularly in the later tetralogies, I doubt whether Burnet himself always supposed that what he prints without marks of doubt is what Plato wrote. In many cases, I believe, the presence of a reading in his text means simply that it is pretty clearly what stood, so far as we can judge, in the 'archetype,' and that it cannot be corrected with any certainty.

Once more I would most heartily commend this valuable book to every serious student of Plato.

A. E. TAYLOR.

*University of Edinburgh.*

#### PLATO: DOUBTFUL AND SPURIOUS WORKS.

*Platon: Oeuvres complètes.* Tome XIII., 2<sup>e</sup> Partie: Dialogues suspects; 3<sup>e</sup> Partie: Dialogues apocryphes. Texte établi et traduit par JOSEPH SOUILHÉ. Two vols. Pp. (i.) xiii + 380; (ii.) 346. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. 30 fr. each.

IN 1926 M. Souilhé gave us the Platonic *Epistles* as the first part of Vol. XIII. of the Budé Plato: he now completes the volume with these two further parts. No. 2 contains *Alcibiades II.*, *Hipparchus*, *Minos*, *the Rivals* (or *Lovers*), *Theages*, and *Cleitophon*, all classed together as 'suspect.' The several degrees in which these writings are derived from undoubted works of Plato, and the probable circumstances of their composition, are fully and judiciously discussed. *Alcibiades II.*, on the subject of prayer, is ascribed to a scholar of the Academy, about the end of the fourth century, who worked partly on the lines of *Alcibiades I.*, and partly on suggestions from the *Laws* and other

Dialogues. *Hipparchus*, on the meaning of love of gain, takes its title from a curious digression on the excellence of Hipparchus' rule over Athens in 527-514 B.C., and on the motive of the conspiracy that brought about his death. M. Souilhé gives some reason for supposing that it was this story, published about the beginning of the fourth century, that drew from Thucydides his two counter-statements in I. 20 and VI. 54 of the History. *Minos*, on law, is found to be comparable with *Hipparchus*, both in scheme and in treatment, but not necessarily by the same author: it is placed rather later, towards the end of the fourth century, and is furnished with interesting notes on points of legend. *The Rivals* conducts its discussion of philosophy on a higher plane of art; but its conception of philosophy as little more than political science places it, most probably, in the time of Polemon's direction of the Academy (314-270 B.C.). *Theages*

treats of the mysterious influence of Socrates upon his young associates, and illustrates the growth of the legend of his prophetic powers. The author has based much of his work on some passages of *Theaetetus*; and if Theages' wish to be ruler of the world and to be deified is an allusion to the career of Alexander, the date may be about 300 B.C. (not 200, as by a slip the editor suggests). *Cleitophon* presents us with a strenuous attack on the Socratic teaching, delivered by a friend of Theramenes and Thrasymachus—one of those half-political, half-philosophical orators who disliked the ostensible proceedings of Socrates. The editor gives a careful review of the arguments for and against the authenticity of this curious piece, and concludes that it may be a pamphlet by Plato himself, aimed against certain distortions of Socratic teaching, and developed later into the larger discussion of the *Republic*. Yet it may well be urged that the style, though elaborate in some parts, is in others far too flat and colourless for Plato.

Part 3 begins with the *De Justo*, a dull little specimen of sophistic exercise: as it bears no distinct trace of a study of Plato, it may be regarded as contemporary with his work. The *De Virtute* is similar, but clearly connected in its subject-matter with *Meno*. *Demosdocus* comprises a discourse on deliberation and three dialogues on elementary moral problems like those which were commonly posed by the sophists, and which led to the *Problems* of Aristotle. M. Souilhé suggests that this batch is the work of the Megaric School in the fourth century. *Sisyphus*, in a feeble

attempt at dialogue-form, also discusses deliberation, with borrowings from *Meno*, but without any interest in research: it is ingenious sophistic work of the time of Aristotle. *Eryxias* draws a lively picture of Athens before the Sicilian Expedition (415 B.C.), and discusses the meaning of wealth. It shows some ability in handling the Platonic form, but no grip or connexion or characterisation. Apparently prompted by *Euthydemus* and *Meno*, but evidently tinged with Stoic and Cynic doctrine, it probably belongs to the third century. *Axiochus* is composed in a mixture of the narrative and dramatic forms, and deals with the fear of death. The arguments of Prodicus having failed to reassure, the reasons produced by Socrates for belief in the immortality of the soul are found convincing and comforting. They are confirmed by the myth of Gobryas, which tells of the happiness of the just and the misery of the unjust in the after life. This work is an example of the consolation-pieces which were started by Crantor in the Academy during the first half of the third century. The writing is strange in diction and construction: M. Souilhé has a long and interesting discussion of the signs of Epicurean influence in the thought. He is inclined to place it towards the Christian era, and to ascribe it to a rhetorician of the Academy. The *Definitions* describe in short sentences a miscellaneous collection of moral and other terms: some appear to date from the Academy of Plato's time. The notes here provide a useful array of references. The translations throughout are reliable and neat.

W. R. M. LAMB.

#### THE METAPHYSICS OF THEOPHRASTUS.

ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΥ ΤΩΝ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΑ ΦΥΣΙΚΑ: *Theophrastus, Metaphysics*. With translation, commentary, and introduction by W. D. ROSS and F. H. FOBES. Pp. xxxii+87. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929. 7s. 6d. net.

THE work here presented, commonly called Theophrastus' 'Metaphysical Fragment,' is a preliminary discussion

of metaphysical questions, comparable to Book B of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, but a good deal shorter than it. A number of connected questions are stated, and usually some indication is given of the direction in which their solution is to be sought. There is no evidence that Theophrastus ever wrote the metaphysical treatise to which this was presumably intended as a preface; so that

these few pages contain the only explicit evidence we have or are likely to get as to the metaphysical views of Aristotle's successor as director of the Lyceum.

Mr. Ross and Mr. Fobes have given us, what we should have expected from them, an exemplary edition of this tract. The manuscript tradition has been carefully investigated and the relation of the various manuscripts determined; the text has been improved, not merely in this way, but also by a number of acute corrections from Mr. Ross: and when the reader has consulted the translation printed opposite the text, together with the summary of the argument given in the introduction and the detailed explanations in the commentary at the end, he finds himself with no excuse for doubt as to the editors' interpretation of the text and little room for disputing their conclusions. For all this we can only express proper gratitude, and cordially commend the book to all students of Greek philosophy.

In their introduction the editors characterise briefly Theophrastus' historical position and the value of this tract. They admit that its author was not a great metaphysician, and they say that as 'the culmination of the reaction which Aristotle began from the bold metaphysical speculation of Plato' Theophrastus is to be regarded as 'first and foremost a man of science.' It is a pity that they have not taken more opportunity, either in the commentary or elsewhere, for detailed substantiation of this judgment. In the introduction they only draw the negative conclusion that the author's interest in metaphysics was confined to asking 'intelligent questions.' But the point of view should be significantly betrayed in the questions asked. A student of Aristotle who reads

this tract has a feeling in reading it that important conceptions have shifted somewhat obscurely from their Aristotelian position and emphasis. The first sentence refers to the subject as *ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν πρώτων θεωρία*, and the first question stated is as to the relation between *τὰ νοητά* and *τὰ τῆς φύσεως*. Further on the 'first thing' seems to be taken as omnipotent (5b 15) and divine (4b 15, 6a 1); yet we read (11b 12) that 'even among first things we evidently observe many events that happen at random' (*ὥς ἐτυχεῖν*). I mention these points as constituting one example—others could easily be supplied—of a class of problem which requires for its elucidation a more historical treatment than the editors give us. We have here implied, on the one hand, a dualism of natural and supernatural, such as Aristotle was in most of his thought consciously opposing and striving to overcome; and, on the other hand, a tendency to extend the acceptance of irrationality in the universe. The latter tendency might be expected from a philosopher with a bias towards scientific empiricism, but the former is not so easily brought into focus from this angle.

Thus my gratitude to Mr. Ross and Mr. Fobes for what they have given us is tempered by a sense of the limitations of their contribution. But probably it is unfair to put this as a criticism of their work. Perhaps it should rather be put in the form of a demand for a historical study of Theophrastus in his relation to Plato and Aristotle, which will continue it. The successful achievement of such a task might mean much for the understanding of Aristotle's metaphysical position.

J. L. STOCKS.

*University of Manchester.*

#### HELLENISTIC WARFARE.

*Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments.* By W. W. TARN. Pp. 170. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 6s.

THE crowded history of Hellenistic warfare is here reviewed in a masterly summary which raises all the chief

problems involved, and as often as not provides a new solution to them.

In Ch. 1 Mr. Tarn sketches the history of Hellenistic infantry. He points out that the proper rôle of the phalanx was to serve as a point d'appui for cavalry—a fact fully realised by Alexander and



his immediate successors, but forgotten by the Antigonid kings of Macedonia, who thus presented the Romans with somewhat undeserved victories.

Ch. 2 may be described as the first serious attempt to follow out the development of ancient cavalry. Mr. Tarn shows that the Asiatic peoples here led the way. After the failure of the Persian archers of the Greek wars the Achaemenid kings put their whole trust in their mounted troops, which won their spurs at Cunaxa by turning a lost action into a victory. Subsequently the Parthians produced two new battle-winners, the cataphract mounted on a special breed of charger (the prototype of the medieval war-horse), who could ride down anything but Roman infantry, and the mounted archers who made such a brilliant début at Carrhae. Yet the finest ancient cavalry captains were Alexander and his immediate successors (with Hannibal as a somewhat belated pupil), for these possessed the all-important gift of judging the right moment for a charge. Alexander's immediate successors also discovered the one really effective function of the battle-elephant, to serve as a screen against cavalry attacks.

Ch. 3 traces the rapid improvement of Hellenistic siege-craft and the corresponding progress in the art of fortification. The new artillery (inclusive of flame-carriers, of a repeating catapult which embodied the essential idea of the machine-gun, and of poison-gas—Livy 38. 7) eventually told in favour of the defence, as happened again in 1914-8. The same chapter also discusses Hellenistic warships, and at last supplies a convincing explanation of their systems of oarage. Mr. Tarn shows that the quinqueremes and other big types were not as monstrous as their names suggest, and were not even solid enough to carry catapults. It may be surmised that they were not an improvement on the trireme; but our knowledge of Hellenistic naval battles is too scanty to settle this point.

The above details will suffice to show how much new ground Mr. Tarn has broken. His book is a substantial contribution to the general history of the world's war-craft.

The American Federal man-of-war that sank the *Alabama* off Cherbourg was the *Kearsarge*, not *Kearsage* (p. 116).  
M. CARY.

*University College, London.*

### MEDALLIONS.

*Medallions.* By RICHARD ALDINGTON. Pp. 117. London: Chatto and Windus, 1930. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THIS charming and elegantly printed little volume is a collected reprint of four brochures separately published between 1915 and 1919; it will be acceptable to those who knew them, and to a wider circle of readers. It consists of prose translations, with brief introductory notes to each section, of (1) the 25 epigrams by Anyte in the Greek Anthology; (2) 138 of those in the Anthology attributed to Meleager; (3) the hemiambs, also preserved in the Anthology, under the name of Anacreon—metaphrases executed in the late Alexandrian period in this childish but attractive metre, which, from their simplicity and prettiness, have had a wide European circulation ever since their discovery by Salmasius at the beginning of the seventeenth

century, especially as a text-book in schools for beginners in Greek; and (4) a selection from the Latin epigrams and idylls of about a score of Italian scholars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, including among other less prominent names those of Pontano, Navagero, Sannazzaro, and Politian.

The translations, mostly executed in or behind the trenches while Mr. Aldington was on active service during the War, have a full claim to the lenient judgment which he asks for them, and are in fact very good. There is only one piece out of the whole selection in which he breaks down, and that from the lack of a commentary and not from any defect in scholarship: a couplet of Meleager's (*Anth. Pal.* V. 192), where the pun in the original (a poor enough one) has been missed and so the whole meaning lost. Otherwise, Mr. Alding-

ton's versions give with much success the substance and tone of the originals; though, as he fully recognises himself, in epigrams as well as in lyrics and pastorals, no prose can give the quality of poetry, its intangible beauty or its verbal melody. In a prose rendering, the poetical quality of these poems—it varies very much even in the work of one author, and still more widely in the product of different ages and countries—is reduced, so to speak, to a greatest common measure. One would not gather from this volume that there was any essential difference, as poetry, between the Hellenistic or Graeco-Roman *Anacreontea* and the pure Greek work of Anyte: one would hardly realise how subtly and yet how vitally the graceful verse of the Italian humanists is apart, at two removes, from the Greek which is its ultimate source, but which filters to it through the Latin tradition of which they were the inheritors. The analogy of sculpture, Greek, Roman, and Italian, is enlightening;

in both arts, as in all art, one spirit successively re-embodies itself in new language.

That is just what makes this collected volume so valuable: it shows, reduced and clear as though in a convex mirror, the movement of poetical instinct and expression, within the same defined field, over a space of some seventeen centuries, from the Greek Arcadia of Anyte to the Italian Arcadia of Sannazaro. It links the whole process with the still later flowerage of our own Elizabethan and Caroline poets. Politian's memorial verses on *la bella Simonetta* renew, with a fresh beauty of their own, the lamentation of Meleager over Heliodora. The harvesters' invocations, in Latin by Navagero, in French by Du Bellay in the famous and exquisite lyric *D'un vannneur de bled aux vents*, both trace their source to an epigram by Bacchylides in the purest Greek manner and dating just after the Persian wars.

J. W. MACKAIL.

London.

#### ORPHISM.

*From Orpheus to Paul: A History of Orphism.* By V. D. MACCHIORO. Pp. 262; 12 photographic plates, 1 plan. London: Constable, 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

ONE can only mention here a few individual faults of this book, which may yet illustrate the generally applicable truth that its author takes too much for granted, argues illogically, and is careless in his use of evidence.

His main contentions are that Orphism was a well-organised religion (he speaks several times of the Orphic priesthood without further explanation of this body) standing in sharp contrast to the orthodox beliefs, and influencing particularly the philosophy, of the Greeks, that it centred in an eschatology based on the primitive phenomenon of collective visions, and had its origin in a historical founder capable of experiencing and imparting these visions which the primitive mind conceives as actual journeys to another part of the physical world.

The first chapter divides Greek

religion into state or aesthetic and popular or mystic. Orphism belongs to the latter, whose characteristic is a primitive strength of imagination which makes fantasy appear reality. This is the whole argument of chs. 1 and 2. In ch. 6 we are given a different dichotomy, in which Orphism figures as a doctrinal as opposed to a spontaneous religion. As such it must be spoken of as lacking in imaginative content. Both descriptions are allowed to stand independently.

The discoveries in the South Italian *timboni* serve as evidence for a funeral rite dependent on the *σῶμα δεσμωτήριον* belief, namely cremation. 'While the body exists there is a possibility that the soul may again enter its former prison.' For the author Orphism and Pythagoreanism are identical in religious doctrines (p. 167), and apart from the question whether the Orphico-Pythagorean believed that a soul might re-enter the same body, Iamblichus (V.P. 154) says of Pythagoras *κατακαίειν δ' οὐκ εἶα τὰ σώματα τῶν τελευ-*



τησάντων. He conjectures that this cremation is the rite alluded to by Plutarch in *de Deo Socratis*, without which the Pythagoreans believed the dead could not be happy, although Plutarch 'takes the greatest care not to disclose the least bit of the secret rite'; and so, in emphasising later the continuity of Orphic traditions, he feels himself in a position to state (ch. 6, n. 3): 'The funeral rite evidenced by the *timboni* conforms perfectly with Plutarch's dialogue on the Socratic Demon.' One could go far on such arguments.

We are to consider the *Katabasis* in *Od.* xi as entirely Orphic, but Signor Macchiore does not take the best way to convince us, since we have to believe that although 'for the sixth and fifth century Greeks the Homeric poems were a religious book,' and that they 'constituted practically the whole source of religious conceptions and thoughts for the Greek,' yet the Orphic priesthood at Athens, forming a majority of the Pisistratean editorial committee, could essentially transform a book of the poems, 'which of course had long before been written,' without the change being noticed.

In the chapter on Orphism and philosophy a plausible case has been made out for the connexion between Heraclitus' thought and the Orphic theology. It might have been worth while to strengthen it by the striking parallel of the acquisition of λόγος and νοῦς by ἀναπνοή (Heraclitus acc. to Sext. Math. 7. 27 = RP 41) and the acquisition of soul ἀναπνεύοντων, ascribed to an Orphic λόγος by Aristotle, *de An.* 410b 27 ff.

Our chief quarrel is with the doctrines

ascribed to Plato. We are made uneasy earlier in the book, when asked to believe (p. 12 and n. 7) that the χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος advocated in *Phaedo* 67c was just a physical ecstasis, and (p. 13) that Plato recounts the experiences of Er 'without the least doubt of the real existence of the world he saw.' Primitive realism survived in the best Greek philosophy. The story told in later times of Pythagoras' belief in the reality of dreams (Iambl. *V.P.* 169), not quoted here, might, for what it is worth, have helped this theory, which nevertheless is almost certainly wrong when it leads to the statement (p. 177) that 'the Platonic myth, which is a subjective reality, appears to be a λόγος, i.e. an objective reality.' The passages he quotes from the *Gorgias* (522e-523a, 524b, 526b: why the last?) are outweighed by such a contrast of the two terms as *Tim.* 29c, d, and by the epilogue and whole atmosphere of the *Phaedo* myth. Then it looks as if a passage of Aristotle (*Met.* A, 987a 29 ff.), used first as argument for Heraclitus' debt to Orphism and again for Plato's, only suits the writer's purpose so well because he has translated παρὰ τὴν τῶν Ἰταλικῶν φιλοσοφίαν as if it were παρὰ τῆς τῶν Ἰταλικῶν φιλοσοφίας. He has certainly reversed the meaning of the whole passage.

There are some small misprints—e.g., ch. 9, n. 7, ὄν for ὅν, n. 8, cultu for cultu, p. 172, astragolos: syndone and *Erichepaeus* are apparently not misprints—and a certain carelessness in giving references. Cf. the reference 'Pindar 7. 45' (ch. 1, n. 16), and in ch. 8, n. 1 *Convivium* 2. 3 should be *Quaest. Conv.* 2. 3. I.

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

Peterhouse, Cambridge.

#### ANIMALS IN GREEK SCULPTURE.

*Animals in Greek Sculpture.* By GISELA M. A. RICHTER, Litt.D. Pp. xii + 87; 11 illustrations in the text and 66 plates (236 figures). Oxford: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 30s. net.

WHILE it is true that Greek sculpture took man, or gods in the form of man, as its main theme, Miss Richter's book is a timely reminder that the Greeks

also excelled in the representation of those animals which are connected with the worship of the gods, the exploits of heroes, and the daily life of man.

The author interprets the term sculpture in a wide sense to include coins, gems, terracottas, and heads on proto-Corinthian jugs, as well as sculpture in the stricter sense. Hitherto the only

book available on the subject has been the well-known work of Imhoof-Blumer and O. Keller, which deals only with coins and gems. Though we cannot help wishing that Miss Richter had given us a complete survey of animal representation in Greek art by including also vase-paintings, we must be thankful for the rich feast which she has provided for us.

The book falls into four parts: a general introduction to the subject, including a bibliography; a separate description of the treatment of each animal; a descriptive list of the drawings and plates; and a long series of plates.

As would be expected, we find the same evolution in Greek animal sculpture as in the representation of the human form. The earliest monuments show a stylistic and conventional treatment due to Oriental influences; then in the fifth century come a freer rendering and a closer observance of essential characteristics, still tempered by a sense of decoration; and, finally, in the Hellenistic age the treatment becomes thoroughly realistic. This process of evolution may best be traced in the horse and the bull; the lion, though so popular a subject, is hardly typical, since it was known only at second hand in the more advanced Greek communities. Our literary authorities state that in classical times it occurred only in the extreme north of Greece and in Thrace and Macedonia. This suggests that the excellent representations on the coins of Acanthus may be due to actual observation; but most of the lions which have come down to us are obviously the work of

artists who had never seen the real animal. The Lion of Chaeronea, for example, which still dominates the battlefield on its original pedestal, though decorative and highly effective, has hardly any of the characteristics of a lion. The horse, on the other hand, provides an excellent illustration of the evolution of an animal type over the whole period. It would be an interesting study to trace the influence of Greece through Roman and Renaissance sculpture upon modern equestrian portraiture.

It will come as a surprise to most students of Greek art that the list of animals represented includes fifty-four varieties, among them the Zebu, the Hedgehog, the Parrot, the Cicada, and the Praying Mantis.

The illustrations are admirably selected and reproduced, and include not a few less familiar objects from American Museums. There are a few which one misses: for example, the Prancing Horse from the west frieze of the Parthenon, the finest extant Greek representation of a horse in relief. Again, no example is given of the goose in sculpture in the round, for which the group of the Boy and Goose after Boethus might have been cited; also, reference might have been made to Fig. 86 (Europa and the Bull from Selinus) for the representation in sculpture of a dolphin, of which examples are given only from coins and seals. These, however, are only criticisms of detail which do not detract from the value of a highly interesting study of a fascinating field of Ancient Art.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

*University of Sheffield.*

#### DI PATRII INDIGETES?

*Terra Mater: Untersuchungen zur altitalischen Religionsgeschichte.* By FRANZ ALTHEIM. Pp. viii+160. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930. M. 9.60.

THIS work follows closely on a somewhat longer essay by the same author,<sup>1</sup> in which he laid the foundations upon

which his theory rests. He now seeks to illustrate and confirm it by studying certain Italian cults which had, or which he believes to have had, a more or less direct connexion with the worship of Mother Earth.

His general position is as follows. It has been too lightly assumed, ever since Mommsen's brilliant suggestion that the festivals given on the surviving Roman

<sup>1</sup> *Griechische Götter im alten Rom*, same publisher and date. I have reviewed it in *Gnomon* and *J.H.S.*

calendars in large letters were those of the oldest stratum, that these were festivals of Italian, indeed of Roman gods pure and undefiled. If, however, we examine these deities closely, we find that more than one is of demonstrably Greek origin, brought to Rome from other Italian communities, generally through Etruria. Further, an investigation of those divine figures which Wissowa classes as *di nouensides italischer Herkunft* shows a far larger Greek, or Graeco-Etruscan, element than the orthodox works on the subject allow.

With this general position the reviewer is inclined to agree. The very fact that the festivals in question appear on a regular calendar, of patently Greek form, dating, it may be, from the days of the Etruscan dynasty, ought to put us on our guard; the more so as one of the first of them, that of Anna Perenna, cannot, on the usual interpretation of her name (which Altheim rejects), be earlier than the regular twelve-month year which succeeded the older one of ten months with a gap at the end; nor can Ianus have had an *agonium* on January 9 in the days when there was no 'month of the entrance-door' for him to be god of. It is with details that I would quarrel, finding the proof of the non-Italian origin of this or that particular deity insufficient, though ingenious.

The main positions defended in the present work (which, with the earlier one, constitutes Vol. XXII. of that admirable series, *R.G.V.V.*) are as follows: Pp. 1-15, Proserpina is Graeco-Italic. Pp. 15-48, Liber and Libera are no Italian deities at all, but pure Greek. Pp. 48-65, *persona* is not a Latin word, but an Etruscan diminutive in *-na* of *persu*, which means a spirit of the underworld, or a mummer who plays its part; like several ancient diminutives, it means a representation (of such a spirit) worn by an actor. Pp. 65-91, *oscilla* belong to 'den Kult des Dionysos als Herrn der schwärmenden Seelen, als

Gott der Toten.' Pp. 91-108, Anna Perenna is not Latin, but to be connected with *Anna* and *Perna*, who are of Italic origin, and can be restored from derivatives of their names. She was connected with the cult of the dead, not with the year. Pp. 108-129, Ceres and Demeter are identical. Pp. 129-146, Flora is an 'indigitation' of Ceres, and, like her, is closely connected with the cult of the dead. The concluding section consists of remarks on the cult of Ceres and her associates at Agnone.

As already said, the fundamental principle has much to commend it, but the details must be judged separately, on their merits. To do so here would involve far too great an expenditure of space; I therefore content myself with a few very general remarks.

Firstly, while willingly admitting that Liber, Libera and Ceres were all greatly influenced, and that from early times, by Dionysos, Kore (or some deities of Greek origin equivalent to these two; I doubt Altheim's suggestion of Eleutheros and Eleuthera) and Demeter, I cannot accept the logical consequence of his derivation of them, which would seem to be, that Italy had no native deities of corn and wine, or none of any importance. Therefore, I feel bound to reject the derivation itself. His theory of Anna Perenna strikes me as wholly fanciful, and his preoccupation with rites of the dead as a perfect obsession. Throughout the book, he seems to depend far too much on linguistic evidence, to the undervaluing of other proofs. Finally, he is too ready to assume that the Greeks and the Etruscans alike were always the lenders to Italy. He forgets that the former borrowed quite readily from foreign religions which were not too unlike their own, and were especially ready to cultivate good relations, wherever they went, with the *θεοὶ ἐπιχώριοι*; while the latter seem to have had a notable genius for borrowing everything from all and sundry.

H. J. ROSE.

*St. Andrews University.*

## CATO RETRACTATUS.

*Catos Hausbücher : Analyse seiner Schrift De Agricultura nebst Wiederherstellung seines Kelterhauses und Gutshofes.* Von DR. JOSEF HÖRLE. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, Bd. XV., Heft 3/4.) Pp. viii + 270. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1929. Rm. 16.

THE puzzle of the text of Cato—its inconsistencies, repetitions and incoherences, the variety of its form, ranging from a mannered literary style to the barest ungrammatical notes, and the ascription of this medley to one who had a reputation as a precisian—has long exercised its students. Dr. Hörle begins his solution by making a detailed analysis of the whole book. He finds that it falls into five main divisions, each forming a unity separated from the others by differences of language and content, but containing no discrepancies within itself, and a number of short inserted pieces, documents, references to authorities, addenda and the like. The arrangement cannot be the work of Cato; it must be a collection made from Cato's works or notes by an unlettered person for practical use. The condition of the text can be explained by assuming that the collector found his material on papyrus sheets, put them together as he chose, and made them into a roll—a *Flickband* such as Peter suggests as the original form of Cicero's collected letters to Atticus.

Of the main divisions, two (the Introduction to Agriculture and the Cabbage-chapters) are literary, two (the Recipe-book and the Steward's Handbook) are not: the Farmer's Calendar is literary in structure but not in language. The Cabbage-chapters show two versions inextricably combined and point to a 'scissors-and-paste' rearrangement of the original. The Introduction is shown by analysis into sections also to consist of different versions mechanically joined: the sections contain 24-26 lines of Keil. In these divisions Dr. Hörle discerns three strains: (1) Some work belonging to the period just after Cato's return from Greece; (2) part of his first *Institutio ad M. filium* written about 180, covering *de agricultura* (in general

terms, without details or examples), *de medicina* (now represented by *brassica*), and other sections now lost; (3) a later edition written about 168 for his son when he was old enough to be a farmer. The original of this composite work lost its importance when fuller treatises appeared; but the rough copy remained among many other papers in *der Truhe des Catonischen Landguts*, and the pieces were put together by the compiler with the rest.

The other divisions also fall into similar units of about 24 lines of Keil: the few exceptional cases where the units are not of that length can be accounted for. Interpolations, misplaced glosses and the lists of c. 135 point to an original line of about 36 letters: so it can be calculated that the original text had about 30 lines to the page. Pages of this size, roughly uniform, single or in small groups, were, on this view, the nucleus of Cato's work. Any addition which could not go in the margin or between the lines was put on new pages and inserted among the old. These pages were put together from Cato's *reliquiae* by the compiler, and the result of his mechanical apposition is our text.

The analysis is summed up in a table which breaks up each subject-division (now scattered in our text) into strata according to the dates at which the various sections were written. Dr. Hörle finds confirmation for his theory of a developing unity in the evidence of language. Old or vulgar forms, he finds, are preferred only in the older strata; in the later, classical forms are substituted. Some of his instances here seem to tell against him—we do not expect to find *pater familiae* earlier than *p. familias*. Examination of the compound verbs, the syntax, and the introductory formulae of the chapters shows corresponding variation.

The third part of the book deals with the construction of Cato's *trapetum* and *torcularium* (with diagrams to scale) and the estate buildings and equipment. The book would have gained much from compression, and the author seems to claim much more certainty



for his reconstitution than the nature of his material and his method justify; but his close examination of the subject-matter is useful, and his argumentation, though often tenuous, is interesting. He makes some emendations by the way, e.g. 157. 1 *quae vocatur vis bona, in commixta natura*, 157. 7 *nihil istarum*

*usu veniet morbi*: but when he needs support for his linguistic criteria he is willing to trust the manuscripts in smaller matters where corruption gives an easy explanation of discrepancies.

C. J. FORDYCE.

*Jesus College, Oxford.*

### CICERO TO ATTICUS.

*Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, Book II. Edited by MARGARET ALFORD. Pp. xxix+271. London: Macmillan, 1929. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

THIS edition is the work of a sound scholar, who has made an intelligent and independent use of the best available authorities. It is intended for 'students at universities and the upper forms of schools, and their teachers.' To such readers it may be warmly recommended: they will find their needs, especially on matters of history and language, supplied with a full hand, and will seldom look in vain for help. Room perhaps might have been found for a note on V. 2, 'sed quid ego haec, quae cupio deponere et toto animo . . . φιλοσοφείν,' or on IX. 1, 'illum (dialogum), quem abdis et ais longum esse quae ad ea responderis perscribere,' where the same laxity of expression recurs. But such omissions are rare. Rare, too, are the places where Miss Alford's view provokes dissent: e.g. on XVI. 1, 'ita me pupugit ut somnum mihi ademerit,' she writes: 'the result is viewed from the writer's present. . . . This suggests that the awakened Cicero is writing at once.' If this means that 'ademerit' is perfect, then I think the doctrine of Madvig (§ 382) and Lebreton (p. 228), who explain the tense as aoristic, is the sounder. Again, the note on XXI. 6 *fin.*, 'spero nos aut certe . . . aut etiam,' etc., is to me unintelligible. Is not this merely a case of the careless inversion of 'aut . . . aut,' so common in these letters? Cicero should have written, not 'aut certe . . . aut'—which is a contradiction in terms—but 'certe aut . . . aut' (*Com. Tull.* p. 158). So in *Att.* V. 7 *fin.* we have 'cum ut quid agas tum ubi sis sciam' for the strict

'ut cum . . . tum'; V. 18. 2, 'et nostra mansuetudo et abstinencia' for 'nostra et . . . et'; V. 18. 4, 'et ut tu . . . et nos' for 'ut et tu . . . et nos.' A more serious case of disagreement occurs at XIII. 2, where the note on 'iuratus tibi possum dicere nihil esse tanti' appears to me wholly erroneous. It completely ignores all that Madvig has written on the subject. It ignores, too, the authority of a Latinist greater even than Madvig, viz. Cicero himself, who in the passage before us gives two synonyms for the phrase 'nihil est tanti': 'politics,' he says, 'leave me cold (*lente fero*). Let me daff the world aside (*φιλοσοφώμεν*). I am wholly indifferent to public affairs' (*nihil esse tanti*). Here '*lente fero*,' *φιλοσοφώμεν* and '*nihil esse tanti*' all express the same thought—unconcern or indifference: cf. XVII. 2, '*ἀδιαφορία*, qua nulla in re tam utor quam in hac civili et publica.' This phrase, 'nihil est tanti,' which is no doubt, as Madvig explains, elliptical (= 'nihil habet tantum pretium ut curandum sit'), is rare, occurring only four times in Cicero's letters and once in Horace, always in the same sense, i.e. 'non curo.' Thus *Att.* V. 8 *fin.*: 'ne sit invito Milone in bonis. Nihil nobis fuerat tanti': I told him not to attend the sale of Milo's effects: 'I had no interest in the matter.' XIII. 42 (young Quintus speaks): I am sorry I displeased my mother and my uncle by raising difficulties about my marriage: 'Nunc nihil mihi est tanti. Faciam quod voluit': 'But now it makes no difference to me. I'll do what they wish.' *Att.* XV. 26. 4: 'id me iam nolle nec mihi quicquam esse tanti': 'tell him (an adjoining landowner) that I no longer wish to keep him to his bond, and that I do not care the least about



the money.' So Horace *A.P.* 303, 'verum nil tanti est,' where the adversative 'verum,' like the 'nunc' in Cicero above, proves the sense: What a poet I might have been! 'But no matter!' I'm quite content to play second fiddle.

The text of this edition seems in general discreet. Attention may, however, be drawn to two or three places. In *XX. 1* the MSS. give: 'Pompeius amat nos carosque habet. "Credis?" inquires. Credo; prorsus mihi persuadet, sed quia volo. Pragmatici,' etc. Here Miss Alford follows all recent editors, who, finding no sense in 'volo,' accept the conjecture of Buecheler: 'sed quia *volgo* pragmatici,' etc. But these recent editors had no opportunity of reading Sjögren's defence (1911) of the tradition. He shows that the phrase 'credo quia volo' was in common use: *Caes. B.C. II. 27. 2*, 'nam quae volumus, ea credimus libenter'; *B.G. III. 18. 5*, 'libenter homines id quod volunt credunt'; *Cic. Ep. XII. 5. 1*, 'loquebantur omnes tamen—credo, quod volebant—in Syria te esse.' If, then, the MSS. reading, 'sed quia volo,' is corrupt, it is surely curious that a corruption should result in giving what was practically a current proverb (*Otto, Sprichw.*, p. 97). What Miss Alford means by objecting that 'sed quia volo' is contradicted at the end of the section, I do not know. The section ends 'alterum, ut non credam, facere non possum': where is the contradiction here? She adds: 'the other two sentences are uncomfortably abrupt': quite true, and the same may be said of this whole letter, which is almost entirely jerked out in short, unconnected sentences. Cicero's affection for Pompey—'Pompeius, nostri amores' (*19. 2*)—hardly needs illustration: *cf. II. 21. 4*. Again, at *II. 22. 1*, the MSS. give 'convertit se in nos; nobis autem ipsis tum vim tum iudicium minatur.' Clodius is ranging about, seeking whom he may devour, and attacking at one moment the tresviri, at another 'he turns against us and threatens me personally' with sword and fire. Cicero, of course, freely uses 'nos' to express either the optimate party (*Att. VII. 18. 2*: 'urbem a nobis teneri') or himself

(*Att. II. 21. 6*: 'Clodius inimicus est nobis. Pompeius confirmat eum nihil esse facturum contra me'). The editors however, objecting to the juxtaposition of these two uses in a single sentence, generally accept Wesenberg's conjecture 'in (bo)nos.' So Miss Alford, without a word of comment. Yet the conjecture is not obviously defensible on critical principles, while the reading of the MSS. is supported by the context. When Cicero adds 'nobis ipsis' he clearly wishes to avoid ambiguity with 'nos'; but if 'bonos' had been written in the first clause, there would have been no ambiguity to avoid and 'ipsis' would not have been needed. Therefore the addition of 'ipsis' supports 'nos.' Not that Cicero is usually shy of ambiguity: in *Att. V. 21. 2* and *VI. 1. 14* 'nostra provincia' does not mean Cilicia, although Cicero is writing from Laodicea. Sjögren has two pages of examples, illustrating Cicero's embarrassing use of the pronouns *hic, ille, qui, nos*: he frequently leaves the distribution of these words to the intelligence of his readers—rashly, perhaps, as it now appears. Lastly, in *XX. 5*, Miss Alford prints Klotz's conjecture 'me te Furium scripturum' because it 'seems to account for the variation in the MSS.' What are the facts? Except one unimportant MS. (s), all the MSS. give 'Furio': a majority of the better  $\Sigma$  MSS. has 'me Furio': the rest with  $\Delta$  'et Furio,' which gives no sense. Sjögren, therefore, reads 'me Furio,' i.e. tibi ut Furio, like *Att. VII. 4. 1* 'ne libertinum laudare videar,' i.e. ne eum ut libertinum. I think this view was at least worth reporting.

It is not often that conjectures of value have escaped Miss Alford's vigilance. One gem, however, has eluded, not only her, but also every other editor of this book. Though it is only a matter of a colon, it is nevertheless of ray serene and may be found in the unfathomed caves of the *Journ. Phil.* XXXII., p. 263.<sup>1</sup>

W. T. VESEY.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> 'Sunt enim illi apud bonos invidiosi, ego apud improbos: meam retinuissem invidiam, alienam adsumpsissem.' 19. 4.

## VIRGIL IN THE COUNTRY.

*A la campagne avec Virgile.* By P. D'HÉROUVILLE. Préface de FRÉDÉRIC PLESSIS, ancien Professeur à la Sorbonne. Pp. ii+106. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 12 fr.

THIS little book is in three almost equal sections. The first deals with Virgil's birds, the second with his horses, cattle and sheep (L'Élevage), and the third with his bees. It is a good general introduction to these subjects for French readers, full of miscellaneous information and based on wide reading. If it contains few additions to knowledge, that is partly because the ground has already been well covered. For instance, the twelve pages on pigeons are practically Warde Fowler in French. But the author quotes the dubious suggestion that *palumbes* is etymologically connected with *pallidus*. Most wild pigeons are not very light-coloured. And was the turtle-dove in *Eclogue I. tamed* by Tityrus? There is really no need to suppose this.

On p. 17 some interesting evidence is given of the vocal powers of the wild swan. More than one English observer has been able to support this. The legendary song of the dying swan is based upon fact. French poets are apparently no better than English in depicting the nightingale as a melancholy bird. We have *pleurant* and *gémît* in quotations on p. 30. The author thinks the farmer snared cranes not as vermin but as game for the table (*Geo. I. 307*), and he may be right there. But the suggestion that the Little Owl is an enemy of bees need not be taken seriously. It is quoted as the opinion of someone who saw it perching on a hive and jumped to conclusions.

Why does Virgil speak of the horse's mane on the off-side? The author thinks it is because the ancients habitually mounted on that side. We English civilians always mount on the near-side, but it makes no difference to us which side the mane falls, for we take hold of the hair by the roots, when the modern ugly fashion of 'hogging' allows us to use it at all.

There is a long and interesting discussion of the colour of the ram's tongue, and its supposed effect on the fleece of his progeny (pp. 60-66). The present reviewer is gently and perhaps justly chidden for alluding to 'the superstition about the colour of the ram's tongue.' Several modern French authorities are quoted to prove that the colour of the tongue really does affect the wool of the lambs. It sounds as if they are speaking from knowledge, but no positive evidence is given such as would satisfy a man of science. An instance of five kids at a birth will interest goat-keepers (p. 66).

In the section on bees there is only one allusion to Maeterlinck and that a contemptuous one; which is hardly fair to so charming, if unscientific, a writer. The names of Langstroth and Doolittle show that the author has not neglected some of the best authorities. Musicians will be amused to see drones called 'faux-bourçons,' which seems a very good name for them. The passage about honey as a necessary of life is quoted from the Vulgate version of *Ecclesiasticus* XXXIX. 31. In our English versions it is verse 26. The spellings 'diptheria' (p. 2) and 'chestnut' (p. 56) should be corrected.

Appendix A, which is on the question why Virgil left out so many things that he might have included, seems quite uncalled for. But Appendix B is the most scholarly thing in the book. Its aim is to prove that *glaucus* in *Geo. III. 82* means the colour of the eye, not of the coat. The comparison with *γλαυκῶπις* is apposite, but there is no mention of the fact that elsewhere Virgil uses *glaucus* as an epithet of *salix*, *ulva*, and *harundo* (*Geo. IV. 182*, *Aen. VI. 416* and *X. 205*). And there is nothing in the context of *Geo. III. 82* to shake the belief that Virgil meant what we mean when we talk about a grey or roan horse.

Incidentally I am glad to see that M. d'Hérouville has not departed from the traditional spelling of 'Virgile.' He is supported by the Italian 'Virgilio.'

T. F. ROYDS.

*Haughton Rectory, Stafford.*

## ITALIAN EDITIONS OF HORACE.

Q. *Orazio Flacco: Il Libro degli Epodi.* By CESARE GIARRATANO. Pp. xiv+131. Turin: Paravia, 1930. Paper, L. 28.

Q. *Orazio Flacco: Le Satire.* By DOTT. VITTORIO D'AGOSTINO. Pp. xxxii+322; 2 maps and 4 woodcuts. Milan: Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1930. Paper, L. 20 (School edition, L. 16).

ITALIAN scholars have been very busy with Horace in recent years. Dr. d'Agostino in his bibliography (which by the way contains no names of English commentators) mentions as many as six editions of the *Satires* produced in the last ten years. These two books are of very different character, and intended for very different kinds of reader. The edition of the *Epodes* is meant for advanced scholars; it has an adequate critical apparatus, and many references where quotations are not made. The edition of the *Satires* is intended for boys in the *scuole medie*, and is designed altogether on different lines. In one way they are strongly contrasted: Signor Giarratano's book is well printed with clear type, while the notes in Dr. d'Agostino's edition are printed in such minute type that a Government inspector ought to intervene to save the eyes of the Italian schoolboys.

The edition of the *Epodes* is good and scholarly. The text is sound, and departs little from that of most editors. Signor Giarratano prints in the text Bentley's *ve* in II. 13, Markland's *frondes* in II. 27, Bentley's *magica* in V. 87, and the *nunquam* of the ed. Ven. in VII. 12, which Bentley demanded; in IX. 17 he accepts *at huc*, for which there is a good deal to be said, from a correction of one MS. His notes are very much to the point, and have plenty of illustrations from classical authors. But one might have hoped for some allusion to the discoveries under the Niger Lapis in the note on XVI. 13.

In his introduction to the several *Epodes* he raises larger questions. He argues strongly that Canidia was the real name of the heroine of the Fifth *Epode*, as it was against usage to substitute one Latin name for another.

In the Ninth *Epode* he holds that both Maecenas and Horace were at Actium, and that the poem was written there just before the battle; but the evidence on which he lays stress does not seem very cogent, and his insistence that *nausea* must refer to sea-sickness will not carry weight, unless we are to believe that it was a stormy voyage on the Tiber and not his excesses at the table that led to Antony's misfortune in the *porticus Minucia* (Cic. Phil. II. 66). There is surely no absurdity such as he sees in the idea that, though *capaciores scyphi* were to be brought of sweet wine, it was well to have a corrective in the Caecuban. He dates the Sixteenth *Epode* in 41 and the Fourth *Eclogue* in 39, and therefore holds that Virgil has been inspired by Horace.

There is a full account of the metres of the *Epodes* in an appendix.

The edition of the *Satires* has a sound and sensible introduction and interesting notes on many of the allusions, though several difficulties are not faced. Sometimes the notes contain errors of fact. What is meant by saying that Teucer does not appear in Sophocles' *Ajax*? And is not the scholiast's explanation of *barathrones* without comment likely to make pupils think that *barathrone* is an ablative in S. II. 3. 166? There is a good supply of parallel passages, but they do not always support the editor in his conclusions: e.g. on S. I. 3. 57 he says that *demissus* is the contrary of *probus*, and immediately quotes Cicero, *de or.* II. 182, *ea . . . omnia quae proborum, demissorum.* A good deal of help is given to the pupil; but it seems likely that a pupil who has to be told that *dividit ut=ut dividit*, and that *vetas cur?=cur vetas?* would want still more to have explained the violent hyperbaton in S. II. 3. 211. The grammatical notes are short, and largely consist of labels—sometimes the wrong labels. Textual questions are hardly considered: there is no note at all on the crux in S. I. 1. 88; the still worse crux of 108 in the same *Satire* is dismissed with the note '*qui per quomodo*; è omissa da alcuni editori.' On S. I. 3. 132 all that he says is 'nel codex

Blandin. vetustiss. si ha tonsor.' He believes the eight lines prefixed to the Tenth Satire to be the work of Horace, but suppressed by him—we can only commend his action! But it is in metrical questions that the Doctor is most baffling. In S. I. 3. 73 he says of *tuberibus*: 'qui ha l'ultima lunga,' which is hardly surprising as it precedes *pro-priis*. In S. II. 5. 66 he writes 'atque: l'ultima sillaba di questo verso si elide con la prima del verso seguente.' There is no elision, and the hiatus needs no comment; there are fourteen other open vowels at the ends of lines in this Satire. In S. II. 2. 39 he becomes conscious of the fact that there is only one dactyl in the line, oblivious of the fact that there are as many as fourteen spondaic lines in the First Satire of the first book. He has no note on the long *i* of *illius* in S. I. 10. 57, though that is the only example in Horace, but he calls atten-

tion to the short *i* in the same word in S. II. 5. 29. Nor is he a sound guide on derivations; according to him *ambire* is derived from ἀμφί and *ire*, and he seems to accept Servius' explanation of Anxurus as ἀνευ ξυποῦ, though he admits that Jupiter Anxurus is represented without a beard on some coins.

To illustrate Horace's walk in the Ninth Satire he prints a map of Imperial Rome, containing among other things the palace on the Palatine, the *fora* of the Emperors, and the Colosseum. A map of London marking Cannon Street terminus, the Holborn Viaduct, and Queen Victoria Street, to illustrate the Great Fire of 1666, would be just as much to the point. But Roman topography is not his strongest point, for he says that the Servian *agger* ran at the foot of the Quirinal, Viminal, and Esquiline.

A. S. OWEN.

Kehle College, Oxford.

#### IZAAC'S MARTIAL I-VII.

*Martial: Épigrammes.* Tome I (Livres I-VII). Texte établi et traduit par H. J. Izaac. Pp. xxxix + 272 (really 510). Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 40 fr.

In the text of this edition there are few novelties, and only one, the interrogative punctuation of VII 36 6, is acceptable; but the choice of readings has been made with considered and independent judgment and the general result is good, though Schneidewin's cure for the metre of III 3 4, being itself illegitimate, should have been rejected. Mr Izaac is the second editor to adopt my *tristities* for *tristitia et* at VII 47 6; but I have now defended the MS lection in Manil. vol. V p. 123. In the apparatus criticus, which on the whole is carefully constructed, sundry omissions are due to oversight, as at *spect.* 22 12, I 78 8, 107 7, III 82 2, 18, IV 53 6, 64 19, 66 17, VII 14 7, but many more are capricious and arbitrary, as at II 8 7 and VII 86 7. There are positive errors at *spect.* 12 1, I 29 4, 59 4 ('*lauer a*' is a fiction of Mr Lindsay's, and so is '*subigi a*' at VI 67 2), II 60 3, 61 7, IV 64 34, V 44 1, 60 4, 78 32, VII 35 7, 53 6, 54 8, 64 3, 69 2,

NO. CCCXXI. VOL. XLV.

70 1, 72 3. The worst is VI 27 2 '*Ficelias* edd., *Ficuleas* [dubitanter] Friedlaender' with nothing said of the MSS, where the truth is '*Ficelias* β, *Ficetias* γ, *Ficuleas* Brodaeus.' One nuisance demands particular notice. The sign ω, defined as meaning 'consensus codicum omnium qui praesto sunt praeter eos qui nominatim citantur', is used not only when it serves a purpose, as at II 29 10 '*leges ω, legas XV*' or VI 74 1 '*imus ω, unus PQff*', where the families β and γ split up, but often without any rule or consistency as a casual substitute for α or β or γ or αβ or αγ or βγ, so that the reader must halt and consider which of the six is meant. Take p. 15 '4 *scribit γ, scripsit β. 5 latine loqui ω, latina eloqui β.*' If Mr Izaac were asked why he calls the same MSS γ in the one note and ω in the other, he could not answer; but I can. It all depends on Mr Lindsay. The first note is copied from his; but in the second, to save space, he omitted the lemma and gave only the variant of β: Mr Izaac, inserting the lemma (for which the reader will thank him), could not be at the pains of ascertaining and specifying its

F



authority, but used the vague  $\omega$  for the precise  $\gamma$ ; and the trouble which he would not take once for all must now be taken hundreds or thousands of times over by one reader after another. The inconsistencies of notation are sometimes ridiculous. V 11 'hoc  $\beta\gamma$ , haec  $\alpha$ ', 4 'plana  $\omega$ , plena T':  $\omega$  means the same as  $\beta\gamma$  and T the same as  $\alpha$ . III 16 5 'corio  $\alpha\gamma$ , satis est  $\beta$ ; te  $\omega$ , tu R': to match the first note the second should be 'te  $\beta\gamma$ , tu  $\alpha$ '; to match the second the first should be 'corio  $\omega$  (or R $\gamma$ ), satis est  $\beta$ '.

The translation is clear and fluent: mistakes are not many, and none is disgraceful; but Mr Izaac sometimes prints one reading or punctuation and translates another, as at II 14 7, III 81 4, IV 55 21, VII 19 2-5, 72 6, 87 7. He acknowledges obligation to Mr W. C. A. Ker's version in the Loeb series, and some of his false renderings, as at III 20 12 *delicatae sole*, IV 71 2 *siqua*, VII 15 1 *absistit*, 80 2 *tetricae*, appear to spring from that source; others may be due to Nisard, III 4 1 *requirit*, 65 5 *trita*, VII 17 9 *munere dedicata paruo*, 95 15 *recentem*, 16 *sensus*. The following words and phrases are mistranslated, some of them very strangely, though rendered aright by others: I 41 16 *qui*, 88 10 *mando*, 90 8 *Venus*, 108 5 *migrandum*, II 7 8 *ardalio*, 17 5 *tondet* (and 62 2 *tonsa*), 19 3 *Aricino* . . . *cliuo*, 49 2 *pueris* (and III 23 1), III 15 2 *caecus amat*, 36 7 f. *hoc*, *ut sim*, 55 3 *placeas tibi*, 63 12 *pertriosa*, IV 86 6 *si te pectore*, *si tenebit ore*, V 37 7 *uicit*, VI 13 5 *ludit*, 18 3 *reliquit*, VII 1 1 *crudum*, 18 6 *inguinibus*, 67 2 *mariti*, 80 11 *famulus*. *Memphitica templa* in II 14 7 is rendered 'le temple des deux déesses de Memphis', and these two goddesses are said to be Isis and Serapis. In the following errors Mr Izaac may have more companions. I 106 6 *certae fututionis* is not 'victoire certaine': the substantive is 'jouissance', the adjective has the force which he renders by 'nette' at VI 73 5 and by 'précise' at VII 84 6: compare Shakespeare *Tr. and Cr.* III 2 26 f. 'I do fear . . . that I shall lose distinction in my joys' and Loti *Pêcheur d'Islande* IV 7 'Lui, Yann, connaissant l'effet du vin sur les sens,

ne buvait pas du tout ce soir-là.' II 71 1 the notion of *candidus* is not 'naïveté' but 'bienveillance' or even 'générosité', as again in IV 86 5 and VII 99 5. III 50 4 *oxygarum* evidently is not 'sauce pour le poisson' but an hors d'œuvre. V 16 9 *nunc* is not 'pour l'instant' but 'au lieu de cela', and also in V 20 11, where Mr Izaac does not translate it. VII 18 14 *disce uel inde loqui* is not 'apprends à parler même par là' but 'apprends au moins de là à parler'; and *et* is not 'ou' but 'et'. VII 35 7 f. *ecquid lanaris* is not 'est-ce que tu te baignes' but 'baigne-toi donc'. VII 49 2 *faucibus oua tuis* could not possibly mean 'pour ta faim': what it does mean may be learnt from Plin. *n. h.* XXIX 42 'prodest . . . luteum (ouorum) . . . faucibus scabritiae'. VII 92 9 *subito sidere* is not 'coup du destin' but paralysis; 95 9 *dulcior* not 'plus agréable que moi' but 'qu'elles'; 97 12 *aedes* not 'maisons' but 'temples'.

Some misunderstandings which the translation itself does not betray are indiscreetly revealed by the explanatory notes. They are very wide of the mark at *spect.* 16 4, 28 7 f., II 60 3, 78, III 83, V 30 5, VI 16 1. In II 17 5 there is no 'jeu de mots obscène', and *radit* is incapable of the sense which Messrs Ker and Izaac attach to it. II 28 6 *res duas* is explained by two verbs, one of which is utterly wrong: two nouns are meant, and they will be found in XII 59 10. IV 61 16 *quod uelimus audire* is not 'le récit d'un cadeau fait avec ces richesses' but a piece of bad luck. VI 2 6 *et spado moechus erat* has not the remotest connexion with V 75 or II 60. VI 3 1 *Dardanio* . . . *Iulo* (the father of the Julian house) is safely translated 'au troyen Iule', but then the note blurts out 'c'est-à-dire au peuple romain'. III 14 3 *sportularum fabula* 'à savoir que les patrons affamaient leurs clients'; then 'cf. III 7', where the true explanation is given. III 42 2 *non mihi labra linis* 'qui sentent tes rides (dans un baiser)': they are *rugae uteri*. VII 45 5 *per Siculas* . . . *undas* 'le détroit de Messine (pour aller en Afrique)': what a route!

The notes indeed are the weak part



of the book, for much in them is purely fictitious or definitely false. *spect.* 7 4 'le rôle de Lauréolus fut tenu . . . par un acteur qui, au moment du châtement, disparaissait pour faire place à un criminel'. *spect.* 27 5 f. 'l'hydre de Lerne avait cent têtes qu'il fallait abattre d'un seul coup, sans quoi elles renaissaient'. I 76 11 *Permessus* 'fleuve de Thessalie'. II 80 *Fannius* 'Fannius Caepio'. II 86 2 *nec retro lego Sotaden cinaedum* 'il avait notamment composé des vers qui, lus de droite à gauche, donnaient un sens obscène: on les appelait *κίναδοι*'. III 20 10 *porticum templi* 'sans aucun doute le temple d'Isis et Serapis'. III 68 8 'au mois d'août, les dames romaines fidèles au culte d'Isis apportaient solennellement un phallus au temple de Vénus Erycine'. V 5 2 'Domitien . . . avait composé un poème lyrique'. V 61 5 'les élégants avaient des bagues d'été et des bagues d'hiver. Cf. Juvénal *Sat.* I 28'. V 65 12 *est tibi qui possit uncere Gery-*

*onen* 'Carpophore'. VII 13 3 'Her-  
cule était le fondateur mythique de  
Tibur'. VII 44 6 'Caesonius avait  
antérieurement été en Afrique comme  
proconsul'. VII 97 8 *Turni nobilibus  
libellis* 'poète inconnu'. VII 99 1  
*Crispine* 'riche affranchi, très en faveur  
auprès de Néron.'

I have observed misprints in the French at I 62 2 and 103 5, in the Latin at VI 25 5, 74 3, VII 14 3, 72 2, 87 4, and in the apparatus at III 47 12, 86 3, 93 20, VI 50 3, VII 71 2. Endeavour to make the translation face the text translated has either been lacking or has signally failed at pp. 4 f., 172 f., 189 f., 196 f. The printers have indulged immoderately in their favourite sport of dropping letters on the floor and then leaving them to lie there or else putting them back in wrong places; and at the top of p. 113 of the text their merriment transgresses the bounds of decorum.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

#### FLAVIUS ARRIANUS.

*Flavii Arriani quae extant omnia.* Edit-  
dit A. G. Roos. Vol. II.: *Scripta  
minora et fragmenta.* Pp. li + 324;  
three maps. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928.  
Paper. RM. 12 (bound, 14).

*Arrian with an English Translation:  
Anabasis Alexandri, Books I.-IV.* By  
E. ILIFF ROBSON, B.D. Pp. xvi +  
450. (Loeb Classical Library.) Lon-  
don: Heinemann (New York: The  
Macmillan Company), 1929. Cloth,  
10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THE first book is a Teubner of the highest distinction and utility, and can hardly be overpraised. It gives an authoritative text with a full apparatus, and every possible help in prefaces, bibliography, and index. But it provides much more than might be expected, and goes very far towards being a satisfying commentary. Throughout there is a running fire of valuable references to parallel passages in authors used by Arrian, such as Xenophon and Aelian, and in authors who used him down to Byzantine times. The *Indica* is still further enriched by such citations of modern literature as space per-

mits, and is illustrated by two maps. The *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, which is vindicated as a whole for Arrian, has a map and all necessary explanatory matter. For the incomplete works like the *Parthica* all fragments certainly or probably Arrian's are arranged with great skill, and the commentary becomes exhaustive. In the bibliography one is sorry to miss Pelham's study of Arrian in *Essays on Roman History* (Oxford, 1911).

The Loeb Arrian is disappointing. The text is taken from Dübner, and the editor claims only one suggestion, *ἐνορίων* for *ἐμπόρων* in I. 1. 6. In I. 22. 1 *ἐπάγοντος αὐθις Ἀλεξάνδρου τὰς μηχανὰς . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἐφেষτηκότων τῷ ἔργῳ* is read, and is translated 'Alexander brought up his engines . . . taking charge of operations himself' (*αὐτοῦ ἐφেষτηκότος* Roos). Misprints are too numerous, such as *οἰμένων* p. 28, *παρὰσεβοθηκότες* 88, *ἐδόντες* 112, *ἐπιρεῖ-  
ξαι* 138, *ὀκείν* 144, and the word *παρελ-  
θόντες* is omitted in I. 7. 1. The book must be judged almost entirely as a translation. Practically no room is

found for notes, and the reader is referred for the routes to any serious atlas. Little help is given in real difficulties: for instance, there is no hint whether Zariaspa is or is not the same place as Bactra (which is constantly mistranslated as Bactria). The translation is, on the whole, readable, and has happy touches, but is marred by inaccuracies and a considerable number of serious errors, such as I. 23. 6 αὐτὸς δὲ . . . ἐγκαταλιπὼν ξένους μὲν πεζοὺς τρισχιλίους, ἰππέας δὲ ἐς διακοσίους καὶ Πτολεμαῖον ἡγεμόνα αὐτῶν, ἐπὶ Φρυγίας ἐστέλλετο, 'left as a garrison . . . three thousand mercenary foot: two hundred horse, under Ptolemaeus, he despatched to Phrygia': I. 24. 6 συνεξαίρει αὐτοῖς φρούριον ὄχυρόν, 'took, along with these places, a strong outpost': II. 2. 4 ἐπὶ Χαλκίδος, 'from Chalcis': II. 20. 2 καὶ ἐκ Σόλων καὶ Μαλλοῦ τρεῖς καὶ Λυκίας

δέκα, 'ten from Soli and Lycia': III. 8. 4 Παρθυαίους δὲ καὶ Τρκανίους καὶ Ταπούρους, τοὺς πάντας ἰππέας, Φραταφέρνης ἤγε, 'Parthyaeus commanded the Hyrcanians and Tapurians: all cavalry were under Phrataphernes.'

About proper names a fatality seems to pursue the translator. Apart from ugly forms like 'Sogdianians' and 'Saciens,' Διονυσόδωρος is faced by 'Dionysidorus' (thrice), Πρωτέας by 'Proteus,' Πολυδάμαντα by 'Polydames,' Πασικράτους τοῦ Θουριέως by 'Pasicrates of Curion' (Κουριέως Roos): and it is impossible to understand on what principle the transcriptions Ptolemy, Ptolemaeus son of Lagos, Dareius, Geraistus, Antipatros, Antipater, Menandros, Aristander can coexist.

J. O. THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

#### THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF ROMAN BRITAIN.

*The Archaeology of Roman Britain.* By R. G. COLLINGWOOD. Pp. xvi + 293.

8 plates and 68 illustrations in the text. London: Methuen, 1930. 16s. EVERY Englishman, be he a student of the classics or no, is likely to feel a certain curiosity about the remote past of our island, when the Roman legions tramped the great roads and Roman gentlemen introduced something of the luxury of Italy to the British countryside. When the opportunity occurs to visit a good Roman site or, better still, to take part in a Roman excavation, this vague curiosity may easily be quickened into a positive passion. The classical student has, of course, a further reason for his interest. He can win from the ancient sites a new appreciation of the texts he studies, of Caesar's account of his invasion of Britain, or of Tacitus' record of Roman occupation and conquest in his brilliant life of Agricola. He will find that archaeological and literary studies enrich and supplement one another.

The beginner, however, is likely to find his path beset with serious difficulties. The information he requires is hidden away in a multitude of learned publications, difficult to find and diffi-

cult, when found, to digest. Mr. Collingwood here comes to his aid. Deeply versed himself in the specialist literature of the subject, he understands the interests of the ordinary man and acts to perfection the part of mediator between him and the researcher.

The plan of the book is not historical and chronological, but based on subject. In successive chapters the author deals with roads, camps, forts, frontier-works, towns, villas, temples, inscriptions, coins, pottery, and the rest. He writes simply and concisely, but with a wealth of illustration from excavations, particularly the very important excavations of recent years, and, while introducing the beginner to the subjects in their general outlines, contrives to add much that will be welcome also to the expert—plans of forts and camps, classification of fine and rough wares, or portrait series of the Emperors on coins. Mr. Collingwood, with the modesty of high competence, has sought the assistance of experts on the various branches of his work, but, if the reviewer may judge from the one chapter of which he can speak best, the main credit is still due to Mr. Collingwood himself.

Each reader will make his own

choice of the things that interest and please him most. Special attention, however, may be drawn to the account of the Roman fortress of Eburacum (York, pp. 17 ff.), to the discussion of the problems of Hadrian's Wall (pp. 65 ff.), to the plans of Roman villas (pp. 116 ff.), to the sections on Romano-Celtic temples and Mithraic shrines (pp. 141 ff.), to the chapter on inscriptions (Ch. XI., pp. 162 ff.), and to the admirably lucid explanation of the method of interpreting coin-evidence (pp. 185 ff.).

We owe Mr. Collingwood a very great debt of gratitude, then, for the book that he has written. It deserves to be widely read and to succeed in its

purpose of deepening and extending a living concern about our national past.

Many problems of fascinating interest still await solution—most fascinating of all, perhaps, that of the end of Roman occupation and the dark age that intervened between it and the establishment of the Saxon kingdoms. The solution of these problems depends on continued research, and that research itself again depends on public support. If Mr. Collingwood succeeds in convincing the doubtful of the value of these studies, he will, we are confident, feel amply rewarded.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

### THE DECLINE AND FALL.

*Der Untergang Roms im abendländischen Denken.* By WALTHER REHM. Pp. viii + 176; 1 plate. (*Das Erbe der Alten*. Zweite Reihe, Heft XVIII.) Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930. RM. 6.50; cloth, RM. 8.

*Imperium sine fine dedi.* Behind this confidence in the destiny and the duration of the Empire of Rome lurked, to be sure, from the very beginning, pessimism and distrust. Yet even in the dark days when decadence was evident and admitted, when Pagan and Christian had each rendered the other responsible for plague, famine, and disaster, it was not recognised that the Empire had fallen. To contemporaries neither Alaric nor Romulus Augustulus marked the end of an epoch. For this there were many reasons, political and eschatological—Rome was the last of the Four Monarchies or of the Six Ages of Mankind, and therefore must endure till the coming of Antichrist. Of even more weight were habit and inertia. As Lavisse remarks, the Empire was 'une manière d'être du monde nécessaire, supérieure aux accidents historiques.' And so, to the mediaeval man, human history was Roman history, a uniform and continuous decline. Dante belongs to his time, but Petrarch is modern. For it was not till the rise of a Humanism highly conscious of

itself and of its difference from the immediate past that history was divided into three periods, ancient, mediaeval, and modern. Only then was it possible to discuss the fall as well as the decline, to discover its date and its causes. Such discussion was henceforth to play a leading part in European thought. Secular and rationalistic speculation advanced—as witness Machiavelli and Paruta—but not uncontested. Bossuet raised his powerful voice and like a second Augustine revealed in Rome's decline and downfall the workings of Providence. The eighteenth century, however, more than had its revenge in its own way, in the persons of Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Gibbon. 'Deux fléaux détruiraient enfin ce grand colosse: les barbares et les disputes de religion.' From the elegant irony of Gibbon we pass to the frenzied indignation of Nietzsche at the tragic spectacle presented by the triumph of 'Sklavenmoral.'

Here the book ends, for Nietzsche is 'nach Gibbon der vorläufig letzte der in repräsentativer Weise seine Stimme in dem europäischen Gespräch über Rom erhoben hat.' However, when the time comes to estimate it, this generation will surely be found to have made its contribution to a problem that is perhaps more contemporary than ever it was—to mention only theories about

racial mixture and about the destruction of the bourgeoisie and civilisation by a Red Army of peasants.

To write the record of twenty centuries of European thought is a difficult task. Dr. Rehm seems to have succeeded, in so far as success is possible. He has ranged widely and penetrated

deeply: thirty pages of notes attest his discrimination as well as his industry. The result is not always easy reading, but will be read with profit by anyone who is interested in the history of civilisation.

\* RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

*Griechische Religiosität von Homer bis Pindar und Äschylos.* (Die griechische Religiosität in ihren Grundzügen und Hauptvertretern von Homer bis Proklos, I.) Von WILHELM NESTLE. Pp. 139. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1930. Cloth, RM. 1.80.

DR. NESTLE does not attempt to add one more to the already numerous outline histories of Greek religion. Leaving out of count, so far as is possible, the details of cult, he confines himself to sketching the private religious opinions of representative Greeks, so far as these can be gathered from their surviving writings. He expects (p. 13) to complete his task in four little volumes, whereof this is the first. Naturally, in so short a work, much originality in details cannot be looked for, although the general idea is new, so far as the author knows (*ibid.*); of course, studies of the religious views of single writers, or of groups of writers, are numerous.

After a few remarks on the origin of religion, which owe rather too much to the over-popular theories of Otto, he passes to a good sketch of the religion of Homer, only a little damaged by remnants of the worn-out separatist hypothesis, and then to that of Hesiod, to whom he is a little inclined to credit everything in the Hesiodic corpus (p. 51, frag. 272/247 was doubtfully attributed to Hesiod in antiquity). Next comes the turn of the authors of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., the little sketch of Solon and his opinions (pp. 101-104) being particularly good. Passing then to the lyric poets, he gives a really admirable summary (pp. 107-117) of the ideas of Pindar, and concludes with an account of Aeschylus and a few words on the Ionians. In general, the outstanding features are good sense and good information; the only noteworthy weakness is lack of up-to-date anthropological knowledge (p. 22, theriomorphic gods in Greece have nothing to do with totemism; p. 69, it is unsafe to assume that prayer develops from spells). On p. 74 it is high time that the story about the narcotic vapour at Delphoi was recognised for what it is—a bit of rationalism, unsupported by facts.

Omitting points on which he seems to the reviewer to take the less probable view, the following are small errors which a future edition will no doubt correct: P. 8, n. 1, 'Statius, *Theb.* III. 661: primus in orbe deos fecit timor'; read 'Petron. frag. 27 (daher Stat. *Theb.* III. 661): primus,' etc. P. 42, 'dass das Wort "gerecht" in der Ilias nur einmal vorkommt';

read 'nur dreimal' (viz., A. 832, N. 6, T. 181), and modify the following clause accordingly.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

*Die Griechische Tragödie.* Von ERNST HOWALD. Pp. 183. Munich and Berlin: Oldenbourg, 1930. M. 8.

THE object of this book, according to the Preface, is to discover on what the effect of a Greek Tragedy depends. The first chapter, in the course of a highly abstract and metaphorical discussion, concludes that it depends essentially upon an ordered intensification of the hearer's or reader's feelings—the words used in different passages are *eine Spannungsskala, eine sich steigende Spannung, eine Steigerung unserer Erregung*—followed either by *das Zerreißen* when there is a catastrophe, or much more commonly by an *Entspannung*, when catastrophe is avoided. The feelings roused are concerned typically with the triumph of the good party, at first weak, over the bad and strong. The essence of the tragedy does not lie in the work itself, as that of a painting does, or in the story dramatised, but in the feelings, for which the story merely provides the external occasion. [There seems to be some fairly confused psychology here.] Ancient tragedy in particular had no regard for unity of action (an artistic merit of the work itself): so long as each separate scene produced the right amount of feeling in its proper place in the *Spannungsskala*, all was well; nor did the ancients dream of unity of character in the personages of the drama.

It is not easy to be fair to a theory so one-sided and so strange in its consequences, and want of space precludes a long discussion. But the denial of any unity of character to Eteocles in the *Septem*, to Ajax and to Oedipus, may well lead the reader to suspect the premisses which lead to such conclusions. What are we to say of the statement that there is no weakness or selfishness in Admetus—that Admetus and Alcestis are both *vollkommen gut*; *aber einen Charakter haben sie doch nicht*? Medea too is just a typical *gute und schwache*, but is not a character; though Euripides with his psychological interest did introduce that element of character-study into tragedy, which was to be fatal to tragedy in the strict sense (according to Howald). In fact the writer's exposition of the plays of the three great dramatists itself shows unintentionally at every point the insufficiency of his formula to explain so complex a thing as



tragedy. Hecuba, Ion, and Creusa fit particularly badly into the mould.

The writer's treatment of historical evidence is not always satisfactory, especially in the chapter on the origins of Attic Tragedy. We are not given the ground, *e.g.*, for the statements that Peisistratus borrowed his dramatic festival from Corinth, and that the Corinthian festival was in honour of Dionysos *Δῖος*—the writer deplores the difficulty of equating *Ἐλευθερείς* in sense with *Δῖος*—and that the dithyramb at Athens was not an act of religious worship; and the account on p. 39 of the beginnings of Comedy seems most improbable.

The writer is lavish in expressions of contempt for the views of other scholars—among others for *jene dumpfen Theorien, die, vor allem in England, über die Entstehung des tragischen Spiels ausgeheckt wurden*. Some of them may perhaps survive the attack.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

*Excavations at Olynthus*. Part II. Architecture and Sculpture: Houses and other Buildings. By DAVID M. ROBINSON. Pp. xxii+156; 4 plates (3 in colour), 307 figures. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford, 1930. 90s.

PROFESSOR ROBINSON has been commendably quick in publishing the results of his excavations at Olynthus. The first part by Dr. Mylonas, dealing with the prehistoric remains, was issued in 1929, and this the second part by the leader of the expedition describes the houses, architecture, and sculpture. The plans of the houses are distinctly interesting and resemble the earlier houses at Priene which date from the laying out of that city in Alexander's time, but the author, who assumes that Olynthus was never rehhabited after its destruction by Philip II. in 348 B.C., dates all its houses in consequence to the fifth century or to the first half of the fourth. It must be confessed that most of the houses from their plans would have been called early Hellenistic without the literary evidence, which is not necessarily conclusive. Mycenae was taken and destroyed by the Argives in 470 B.C., and Diodorus, Strabo, and Pausanias all state or imply that it thereafter remained unoccupied. Excavations and inscriptions, however, have shown that the city was re-occupied as a *kome* of Argos in the third century B.C. In the Hellenistic houses excavated at Mycenae have been found bath tubs which are mentioned by Professor Robinson as closely resembling those in the Olynthian houses. Other finds excite similar suspicion, and the idea that it was resettled under Alexander or Cassander should not be excluded as archaeologically impossible. The survey of the excavations suggests that the original town was confined to the South Hill, where at the 'Civic Centre,' perhaps a gymnasium, indications of two architectural periods were found, though no sections of any part of the excavated area are given. Much, of course, depends on the character and stratification of the pottery and other finds in the houses, though Professor

Robinson states that no stratification could be determined. The northern and eastern hills in their relationship to the South Hill and the prehistoric settlement have the appearance of being later additions. It is to be hoped that Professor Robinson will be able to return to Olynthus and check his conclusions by stratigraphical soundings in the areas already explored. The numerous lamps, which are carefully classified, are dated on the same assumption as earlier than 348 B.C., though evidence from other sites, Sparta for instance, where lamps like some of the Olynthian examples were found in Hellenistic tombs, suggests that some might possibly be later. It is also instructive to observe the greater proportion of late lamps among those published from the North Hill. It would have been useful to have added to the notes about the provenance of the lamps some information about their relationship to floor levels. References to the detailed publication of the lamps from the American excavations at Corinth, and a good photograph and drawing of the interesting Nereid mosaic, would have been welcome. The section on the loom weights gives useful information about a class of objects often rather neglected by excavators, but enlarged drawings of the stamps impressed on them might have been expected. More lettering on the plans and illustrations, which are not all of good quality, would have made this report easier to read and to use, especially if all the plates had been grouped at the end of the volume.

A. WACE.

*État actuel des Études sur le Rythme de la Prose grecque. II.* By STANISLAS SKIMINA. Pp. 96. (Eus Supplementa, Vol. II.) Société polonaise de Philologie, Lwów. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 10 zl.

MANY people, the present reviewer among them, know something about Latin metrical prose, a little about Greek metrical prose and the Latin *cursum*, and nothing at all about Greek accentual prose. They, as well as the experts, should be grateful to Dr. Skimina for his concise and lucid summary of the work done in this field by a succession of scholars, including himself. His treatment of a difficult subject is marked by subtlety and sanity. He speaks of other writers with appreciation and sympathy, of his own writings with an attractive modesty.

The work opens with a definition of terms and a formulation of problems: it continues with an account of the theories of Bouvy (1886), Meyer, Litzica (whom Skimina ranks second only to Meyer in importance), Maas, Dewing, De Groot, and others: it ends with a brief summary of results obtained, and an indication of what remains to be done.

Skimina holds that Greek accentual prose is derived neither from Latin accentual prose nor from Greek metrical prose, but from the nature of the Greek language, which is so constituted that two unaccented syllables frequently occur between two accented ones. The commonness of this distribution of accents was in course of time increased in clausulae by aesthetic



preference: and, in general, an even number of intervening unaccented syllables, two, four, or six, was preferred to an odd number. Further, there was a preference for the addition of two unaccented syllables after the last accented one: hence the frequency of double-dactyl clausulae, noticed already by Bouvy. There can, however, be no question of an universally observed 'law.'

In regard to methodology Skimina stresses, among others, the following principles:

(1) That account must be taken, not only of main clausulae, but also of secondary clausulae (at the end of clauses) and of the pervading rhythm of the entire sentence.

(2) That to take into account 'subsidiary' accents, which have played a large part in certain theories, is dangerous, because they depend on subjective judgment.

(3) That many words, such as *οἶτος*, *αἰρός*, *ὑμῖς*, *εὖ*, possess an accent in certain word-groups, and lack it in others. We must consider in each case the accent of the preceding and of the following word, reading, for instance, *χρήματα αὐτοῖς ἔδωκεν*, but *ψυχὴν αὐτοῖς ἔδωκεν*.

(4) That, in the present state of knowledge, rhythmometry can only safely be used to disprove the authenticity of a work, not to prove it.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

*Das Ethos der Mesotes.* By H. SCHILLING. Pp. iv+103. (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, 22.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1930. Paper, M. 6.

THIS book is a careful study of the Aristotelian doctrine of the mean. The author points out the mistake of supposing the doctrine to be a mere injunction to seek 'safety first' by the avoidance of extremes. He gives a fairly full account of the tendencies in Greek thought that led up to the formulation of the doctrine; but he might with advantage have dealt more fully with the part played by the notions of ratio and mean in Aristotle's physical theory. He recognises, however, the main fact, that in Aristotle's view, just as a composite body has a new character in which nevertheless are somehow preserved the characteristics of the elements that compose it, so virtue, and each virtue, is a genuine synthesis in which the elements of good in the opposite vices are united into a whole that transcends them. In each case he thinks that the vice of excess has the greater kinship with the virtue, since it implies a crude sense of the value which the virtuous man more clearly and soberly apprehends; but that the 'excessive' character is spoilt by an exaggerated 'self-feeling' and 'self-mirroring'—in other words, by over-confidence and a tendency to show off. The vice of defect has less kinship with the virtue, but supplies an element that has to be united with the good element in the 'excessive' character to make the truly virtuous state—viz., the element of self-distrust and a feeling for the hard realities of the world we live in. The main interest of the book lies in

the application of this view to the virtues and vices recognised by Aristotle. The theory does not seem to square with Aristotle's actual treatment at all points, and is perhaps least happy as an interpretation of *σωφροσύνη*; for that virtue is distinctly depicted by Aristotle as having the greater kinship with the vice of defect. But the book is a sensible and for the most part well-documented attempt to take the doctrine seriously and to assess its permanent value for psychology and for ethics.

W. D. ROSS.

Oriel College,  
Oxford.

*Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede Philipps von Makedonien* (Beiheft No. 21 to Klio). By WALTHER SCHWAHN. Pp. ii+63. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1930. Paper, M. 4.50.

THIS is a study of the important inscription Dittenberger *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 260 (a) and (b), (a) being a fragment of the Constitutive Act of Philip's League of Corinth, and (b) a fragment of the list of constituent states with their votes. The author makes a fresh and careful attempt to restore (b). Parts of this are attractive, as [*Κερκυραίων δήμου*] and [*Ζακυνθίων δήμου*], taken from the list of the second Athenian confederacy; also he discards the impossible *Ἐλεμίωνων* of l. 3, but inserts in l. 6 the equally impossible [*Χαλκιδέων*]; as Philip was the Macedonian state, no part of Macedonia could appear in the list. But when Schwahn turns votes into the military contingents on which Philip was entitled to call, he doubles the figures throughout; for he takes as basis 1 vote=1,000 hoplites, while it is really 500. Thus he makes Phocis and Locris rated for 3,000 hoplites apiece, whereas in the Peloponnesian League in 377 they supplied 3,000 together; he argues that Phocis' population must have doubled between 377 and 338, but the Sacred War alone would render this impossible, and Phocis' 3 votes certainly mean 1,500 hoplites. The proof is Alexander's Thessalian cavalry, to which he appeals. On his basis, Thessaly's contingent (*Θεσσαλῶν Δ* on the stone) is 10,000 hoplites, which (on the 4:1 reckoning of 377) he makes 2,500 horse; add 500 horse for Achaia Phthiotis, and we get (he says) Alexander's 1,500 Thessalian horse when he called up half their contingent. No source says anything about half their contingent or half of any Greek contingent. The true figures are these: Alexander took 1,800 Thessalian horse with him (according to Fischer, all MSS. of Diod. XVII, 17, 4 give 1,800, one adding φ' in the margin) and 200 came out later=2,000 (their levy in the Lamian War was also 2,000), which on the true reckoning (5:2, as in Demetrius' League of 302)=5,000 hoplites; this seems conclusive that the real basis was 1 vote=500 hoplites. Similarly Schwahn, turning hoplites into seamen according to the reckoning of Demetrius' League, makes the fleet of Philip's League 320 triremes, of which 40 were Athenian; Arrian gives the real figures, 160 and 20. Naturally this doubling of all the contingents vitiates many of his con-

clusions. In the last section, which discusses (a), he (among other things) maintains against Wilcken that the Constitutive Act of the League was not a *συνμαχία*; this is ingenious, but hardly convincing. W. W. TARN.

*Etruria Past and Present.* By M. A. JOHNSTONE. Pp. 258; 40 photographs and plans. London: Methuen and Co., 1930. 7s. 6d.

THIS book, the only one of its kind in English, aims at giving the general reader a simple, vivid account of the main results and problems of research in things Etruscan. The detailed description of tombs and tomb-paintings, sculpture and pottery, which fills the greater part of the book, is used to illustrate Etruscan home life and society in general, the position of women, and the education of Etruscan children. Imagination has of necessity filled many gaps: we are asked to believe, for example, that there were 'famous public schools' in Etruscan Tarquinia, Cerveteri and elsewhere, and the effect of Etruscan influence on the political life of Rome and the artistic life of the Middle Ages is certainly exaggerated. Ducati (whose views have in the main been followed throughout) is surely wrong in taking Marzabotto, a site on the edge of the *Terramare* country, and perhaps for that reason planned on the usual *decumanus* and *cardo* pattern, as the typical Etruscan town; and this assumption smooths the way to over-ready acceptance of most Roman institutions as the gift of the *Etrusca disciplina*. The frequent use of Italian archaeological terms and such forms as *Velio*, *Larte*, *Arunte* is somewhat misleading when the author is dealing with so obscure a language as Etruscan, especially when we are told that 'syntax varied between one state and another.' The constitution both of the Etruscan league and of its constituent states is less well known than the author would suggest, but it is undoubtedly a gain to have the Etruscans presented to us in the setting of general Mediterranean history.

The appendices on Etruscan sites and museums should make the book useful to those who wish to visit them, though it is to be regretted that no scale is given either in the general map or in the plans of Caere and Tarquinii. The illustrations are well chosen and produced.

K. M. T. CHRIMES.

University of Manchester.

*Archivum Historicum Romanum.* By W. ROLLO. Pp. viii+234. University of London Press, 1930. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

THE object of this book is to provide the beginner in Roman History with the means of estimating the aims and methods of Roman historians, and to put at his disposal some of the non-literary evidence. It begins with a short section in which we find Livy's Preface, some characteristic passages of Polybius, and the letters of Cicero to Lucceius and of Pliny to Titinius Capito. Part II., entitled 'The Roman Archive,' is much the longest. It contains not merely the sort of material which may be found

in Bruns' *Fontes*, but a selection from Pliny's correspondence with Trajan and literary references to e.g. the *acta senatus* and *acta diurna*. The Monumentum Ancyranum is given in full (in an antiquated text), and the recently discovered edicts from Cyrene. On the other hand, the letters of Claudius to the Alexandrians and of Tiberius to the Gytheans are not included. The chapter headed 'Inscriptions and Papyri' contains merely the Monumentum Ancyranum and three not very important papyri, though other papyri, e.g. the Egyptian edicts of Germanicus, appear elsewhere. Short inscriptions are completely omitted. The final section contains a short account of the rise of Roman historiography and notes on the leading historians down to Ammianus, with quotation of significant passages.

If a second edition is called for it is to be hoped that Dr. Rollo will include a selection of shorter inscriptions arranged under the subjects on which they throw light, even if this involves the omission of some information which may be found in accessible histories of literature. As it stands, however, the book will be valuable to teachers of Roman History. It is a pity that the proofs were not more carefully revised; there are an incredible number of misprints.

G. H. STEVENSON.

Oxford.

*Cicéron: De l'Orateur, Livre III.* Texte établi par HENRI BORNECQUE et traduit par EDMOND COURBAUD et HENRI BORNECQUE. Pp. 97 double+23. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 20 fr.

OF this book, which Sandys (*C.R.* III. 356) thought by far the most interesting to the student of Latin style, Courbaud had translated as far as §162. The revision of this part, the translation of the remainder, the notes, text, and indices are the work of M. Bornecque, Professor in the University of Lille. Though not free from mistakes (thus § 81 *excludere in nido* 'chasser de son nid') the translation is almost uniformly excellent, and the indices of proper names and rhetorical terms are, so far as I have tested them, full and accurate. The text shows the same readiness as that of Livre II. (*C.R.* XLIII. 41) to admit the claims of the *integri codices*, accepting even *ceram* in § 99. A few improbable changes are made. In § 221, where M.'s *coniuens* has long rightly ousted *contuens*, B. triumphantly presents *contuens* as a correction of his own, adding in his note 'cf. infra' as if the *contuens* in the next line but one were not a further reason for its removal in this one. As containing the V readings the critical index has a certain value—if its statements as regards V can be trusted; but, alas, its information on other manuscripts and the text generally shows an almost incredible carelessness or ignorance. Thus, to take a single example from very many, § 219 *ferre* the reading of the manuscripts is ascribed to Bothe and printed in the text as an emendation, and Bothe's *fui* is ascribed to the manuscripts. If he disbelieved the Cicero editors, had he no Ribbeck? The

proofs, if read at all, have been read with negligence.

H. STEWART.

University College, Nottingham.

*Cicero: pro Quintio, pro Roscio Amerino, pro Roscio Comoedo, contra Rullum.* With an English translation by J. H. FREESE. Pp. 503. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d.

THIS Loeb is not above the low average standard of the series, and is not as good as (for instance) Hodge's *pro Cluentio, etc.*, or Greenwood's *Verrines*. The text is based on that of Müller with slight alterations: a full critical apparatus is of course not to be expected, but citation of the MS. reading on an important point and general intelligibility may fairly be demanded. One instance: *de Leg. Agr.* 99, the Loeb reads *res publica . . . usa est, victorem atque horum conspectu*, translates 'that you might be able to outrage Pompeius . . . and deprive him,' etc. (but where is 'outrage' in the Loeb text?), annotates '*usus est, spoliare Ussing*' (without saying that Ussing read *populus Romanus* for *res publica*), '*res publica munita est, victore Clark*' (which is at least confusing), and gives no hint of the MS. reading. The translation does not read like English: it is sometimes ambiguous (*sic nudos* in *Sex. Rosc.* 72 is translated 'just naked') and sometimes wrong (*de Leg. Agr.* 11. 70 *ingenti pecunia nobis inducetur*, 'we shall always be charged too much'). The notes and introductions are skimpy: there is no note on the earlier colonisation of Capua to *de Leg. Agr.* 11. 92, nor on the subsequent history of the proposals of Rullus.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

Christ Church, Oxford.

*Sallust: von den Briefen ad Caesarem zur Coniuratio Catilinae.* By OTTO SEEL. Pp. 92. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. M. 3.60.

IN the first part of this dissertation Dr. Seel, accepting the Letters of Sallust as genuine, discusses their date and purpose. He dates back the first letter to the period before the Civil War, so as to justify Sallust's apparent impotency in pressing schemes of reform upon Caesar. The crux of the new chronology lies in ch. 3, § 1, where Pompey is said 'to have put weapons into the hands of Caesar's enemies.' Yet this, perhaps, is compatible with a hope on Sallust's part that Caesar would get his second consulship without a war. In his review of the political objects of the Letters, Dr. Seel brings out clearly that Sallust was an outspoken critic of Caesar's military ambition, and he effectively defends his plans for the breaking of the Roman plutocracy against the facile criticism that these were Utopian. He weakens his case by assuming that Caesar was determined *per fas aut nefas* to set up a Hellenistic monarchy. In that case, Sallust after all was merely wasting good ink. If, on the other hand, Caesar had no fixed plans for the future government of Rome

in 50 B.C., Sallust's advice definitely came within the sphere of practical politics.

In the second half Dr. Seel makes a welcome stand against the tralatitious opinion that the *Bellum Catilinae* was intended to shield Caesar's complicity with Catiline. He makes the obvious yet needful point that Sallust's *argumentum a silentio* (for the *Bellum* states no positive case on Caesar's behalf) was no defence at all. He shows that Sallust's errors of fact mostly relate to chronology, and can only have arisen out of sheer carelessness: they do not affect Caesar one way or the other. He reinforces the contention of Boissier (whose *Conjuración de Catilina* he apparently has not seen), that Sallust's antithesis between Caesar and Cato was a very damning compliment to Caesar. The real object of the *Bellum* he is content to find in Sallust's own explanation, that he proposed to exhibit an awful example of a society corrupted by the lust for wealth: and surely we may leave it at that. Dr. Seel unnecessarily assumes that Caesar was an accomplice of Catiline; and he decidedly overstates the case against Cicero's use of the S.C. ultimum. *Sed haec obiter.*

M. CARY.

University College,  
London.

*Vergil's Primitive Italy.* By CATHERINE SAUNDERS. Pp. viii + 226. New York, etc.: Oxford University Press, 1930. Cloth, \$3.

THIS is the work of a student interested in Vergil and possessing a respectable, if second-hand, knowledge of Italian archaeology. Chaps. I-IV., VI.-VII., will be found handy for reference, as giving within small compass the main facts going to prove that Vergil and his authorities, despite the unhistorical form in which their statements are often cast, were by no means always drawing on their imagination for the lives and fortunes of prehistoric Italians. The intention, generally successful, of the authoress is to be fair throughout, presenting, not only the evidence for the views which she herself favours, but also the case for the other side.<sup>1</sup> Her chief defect is that she too often looks to archaeology for an answer which is quite satisfactorily given by some passage in Homer which Vergil imitates.

When she abandons archaeology for comparative religion, the result is not encouraging; the whole of Chap. V. (Human Sacrifice) is vitiated by a confusion between human sacrifice, which is rare and found only at comparatively high levels of civilisation such as that of ancient Mexico, and the burial of attendants, dead or alive, with some person of importance, which is common enough and occurs at much lower levels.

The last chapter is a republication, with slight additions, of her article in *C.Q.*, 1925, p. 85 ff.

I do not understand the note on p. 81. After

<sup>1</sup> As p. 28, where Gabrici's arguments for a Chalkidian settlement at Cumae about 800 B.C. are followed by Randall-MacIver's dating, about 630.

citing Daniel's Servius on Aen. XI. 715, who proves from Nigidius and Cato that the Ligurians were great liars, she adds 'cf. however the much milder comment of Servius himself (on 11,700), with no mention of mendacity'; but Servius gives no opinion of his own and merely cites the same passage of Cato in a shorter form.

A curious mistake disfigures note 39, p. 112. 'A third case' (of something like human sacrifice by Augustus) 'is related by Orosius (5, 15, 3),' and then follows, apparently, a modern English version of Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version of Orosius VI. 21, 27, containing the ridiculous statement that Augustus ordered 'the consul' (apparently Varus, who of course was not consul) to be put to death. The Latin has nothing to this effect. Incidentally, Varus was defeated in A.D. 9, not 28 B.C.

H. J. ROSE.

St. Andrews University.

*Die Sondergötter in der Apologetik der Civitas Dei Augustini.* Von HANS LINDEMANN. Pp. 80. Munich: Kuspert, 1930.

THIS doctoral dissertation is a thorough examination of a subject of great importance to the student of Roman religion. For, if anything is certain about Augustine's knowledge of Roman and Italian divinities, it is that it is derived from the *Res Divinae* part of Varro's lost *Antiquitates*. It is in Books IV., VI. and VII. of the *City of God* that the pagan 'special' gods are mentioned by name and discussed. Not only does this thesis summarise what is stated about them, with a wealth of learned annotation, but it considers at length why they are mentioned at all, including a consideration of the arguments that an extension of an empire may be attributed to the gods, and the significance of the 'special' gods for the extension and preservation of the Roman empire. Two appendices deal respectively with the 'Sondergötter' question, and a comparison of the references made to them in Apologetic literature (e.g. Tertullian) with the Augustinian treatment of the subject.

The following corrections occur to one in reading the book: p. 5, for 'Vogel' read 'Vogels'; p. 73, read 'Marmoraltar' for 'Mamoraltar.'

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Lieferungen 1, 2. By WALDE-HOFMANN. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1930. Paper, RM. 1.50 each.

IT was a serious weakness in Walde's book that, excellent as it was in many respects, it did not pay any attention to chronology nor give the reader any idea which authors or stratum of the language used any given word. In the third edition Walde intended to put this defect right, but unfortunately he did not live to do the work, and it was entrusted to J. B. Hofmann, who recently with M. Leumann brought out the fifth edition of Stolz-Schmalz. Hofmann has long been engaged on the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, and he is eminently fitted to carry on Walde's work. He has made many

alterations and improvements. Instead of citing compounds separately he has saved much space by bringing them under their root word, and he has also rightly rejected many etymologies which all now agree to be no longer tenable. These gains of space have enabled him to state in the article upon each word when it first appears in the language (a most important addition), the authors who use it, whether it belongs to the literary, familiar, or vulgar dialects, and its subsequent history in the Romance languages if it lived on. He has further improved upon Walde's previous editions by paying much attention to problems of gender and of meaning. It is impossible in a short review to discuss adequately such a work, but I may just mention some of the new articles which Hofmann from the inexhaustible treasures of the *Thesaurus* has added: *abitorium*, *ablinda*, *accheruns*, *acudens*, *aloxium*, *alutiae*, *amalocia*, *ambicus*, *amentum*, *amicinus*, *ancorago*, *arceraca*, *archilectus*, *arcisellium*, *baccinum*, *baceolus*, *baditis*, *bagaudae*, *bandum*, *baro*, *baselus*, *bolea*, *bolusseron*, and many more. Full account, too, has been taken of recent advances in our knowledge of Hittite, the Italic dialects, Etruscan, Old Gaulish; and nearly every article shows it. The following have been greatly extended and improved: *ad*, *adulo*, *aedes*, *aequus*, *albus*, *ambulo*, and so on; *augur* is separated from *avis* and connected with *\*augos*, *augeo*; *alpes* has no connexion with *albus*, but is from I.E. *alb*; *alea* not < *\*acslēa*, but connected with *ἡλεός*; *antenna* not < *\*ant'ap'na*, but < *\*an(a)'temp'na*. A very noticeable feature is Hofmann's return to previous etymologies which had been surrendered before the excessive subtlety of the end of last century. Examples of this are *appellare*, *apricus*, *aquilus*, *arepennis*, *arista*, *alienus*, *armentum*, etc. In short, Hofmann's work seems to me excellent, displaying great accuracy and soundness as well as the profoundest scholarship. The remaining parts will be awaited with keen anticipation, and when it is completed the book will be an indispensable work of reference not only to Latinists but to Indo-European philologists generally.

P. S. NOBLE.

University of Leeds.

*Manuel des Études grecques et latines.* Par L. LAURAND. Fascicule VII.: Métrique, Sciences complémentaires (Critique des textes, Paléographie, Épigraphie, Numismatique, Histoire de la Philologie, Bibliographie, Le Travail philologique): 4<sup>e</sup> édition, revue et corrigée. Appendices II.-IV.: L'Art oratoire des anciens, L'Enseignement du grec et du latin, Lectures de littérature grecque et latine. Appendice V.: Petit atlas pratique d'histoire grecque et romaine. Paris: Auguste Picard, 1929.

THIS manual is well established, and the new edition is welcome. In Fascicule VII. I find little change since 1919 except in the bibliographies. We are still told that the dactyl is a rare foot in the Greek tragic trimeter (it occurs over 2,000 times), and that Masqueray's scheme



of the Sapphic hendecasyllable is -u-u|-u-u|-u-u. The appendices, which are new to me, are a worthy addition to the book.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*Robert Browning und die Antike.* Von ROBERT SPINDLER. Zwei Teile in einem Bande. Pp. 371+382. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1930. Paper. M. 50.

IN this stout volume I find a few misprints of Greek and English, an occasional fatuity (as when Catullus, Horace, or Ovid, but not a *Gradus* or other handbook, is suggested as the source of 'Favonian breeze'), and one good big absurdity—the suggestion that 'poor Aesi's broken thread of a life,' in a letter to Miss Blagden, may refer to poor old Aeson. But these are trifles. The book shows an astonishing command of English, of Greek and Latin, and even of the Greek and Latin books that Browning used or may have used.

On a point of English I would plead that 'his neighbours' is right for *rois πῆλας*, though it 'nichts als "andere" heisst,' in Eur. *H.F.* 730.

The chief surprise (though I seem to have heard the truth long ago) is that the setting of *Balaustion's Adventure* depends upon a false reading (from which only a false accent survives into the new Teubner text) in Plut. *Nic.* 29. It was at Caunus, not Syracuse, that a ship was given refuge for Euripides' sake.

If Mr. Spindler should return to his subject he must consult the *Brief Mention* of B. L. Gildersleeve, who held strong and unsavoury opinions about Browning's use and abuse of Greek.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

1. *Myths from Melanesia and Indonesia.*
2. *Myths and Traditions of the South Sea Islands.* By D. A. MACKENZIE. 1. Pp. xii+381; coloured frontispiece and 33 plates.
2. Pp. xii+406; coloured frontispiece and 32 plates. London: Gresham Publishing Company, n.d.

THESE are two volumes of a series of popular works dealing with the mythologies of various peoples. They are somewhat of the scissors-and-paste order, and make little claim to scientific treatment, save that they uphold the Perry-Elliott-Smith theory of the distribution from Egypt of an 'archaic culture.' Such a theory can be neither proved nor disproved by the piling together of casual analogies; nor is it possible to compare myths of different lands fruitfully when no real analysis of any story is attempted. Considered merely as a conglomeration of material, not unhandily arranged but badly needing good indexes and bibliographies, these two volumes are not without their uses.

H. J. ROSE.

St. Andrews University.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY XXIV.

PP. 1-144 (Nos. 1-18: OCTOBER 6, 1930-MARCH 16, 1931).

PP. 1-4, 9-11, 17-18: Reviews by C. Knapp of recent additions to Loeb Library: Aristotle, *Physics* I., Wicksteed and Cornford; Arrian, E. I. Robson; Athenaeus III., Gulick; Isocrates II., Norlin; Philo I-II., Colson and Whitaker; Plato VII. (*Tim.*, *Critias*, *Cleit.*, *Menex.*, *Epp.*), R. G. Bury—'As an example of Professor Bury's method, or rather lack of method, I instance his treatment of the Epistles'; Strabo VI., H. L. Jones; Theophrastus, *Characters*, J. M. Edmonds, and Herodes, *Cercidas*, and Choliambics, A. D. Knox—'Mr. Edmonds's way of editing seems to me the last way in the world likely to attain the truth'; Cicero, *Letters to Friends* III., W. G. Williams; Florus, E. S. Forster, and Cornelius Nepos, J. C. Rolfe; Livy V., B. O. Foster; Ovid, *Art of Love*, etc., J. H. Mozley. Reviews mainly descriptive, with specimens of translations, but also condemn, *inter alia*, the bookmaking technique and inadequate introductions of particular editors, and the failure of the General Editors to evolve any consistent editorial plan. Pp. 11-16, 18-24, 25-28: E. S. McCartney, *Greek and Roman Weather Lore of Winds*: well

documented. Pp. 41-2: S. E. Bassett, *Homer and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*: by examination of *The End of Devil Hawker* discounts value of minor discrepancies as arguments for the followers of Wolf. Pp. 105-8, 113-6: A. Shewan on Leaf's *Homer and History* and the Catalogue. Pp. 122-6, 130-4: T. L. Shear, *Five Campaigns <1925-9> of Excavation at Corinth*: summary of the results. Pp. 137-9: E. T. Sage, *The Treatment of Catiline in the Latin Literature of the Early Empire*. Pp. 141-2: Review of W. L. Westermann's *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt*.

### MUSÉE BELGE XXXIV. Nos. 1-6. 1930.

Jean Pierre Waltzing, 1857-1929. Life and biography by J. Hubaux, with portrait. H. Kesters, *Prométhée dans le Protagoras de Platon*. Antisthenes had made Heracles, representing himself and Cynic ἀσκήσις, charge with pride Prometheus, representing Plato and Academic intellectualism. Plato in his peculiar version of the Prometheus myth is retorting against Antisthenes. G. Funaioli, *Ancora la IV. egloga di Virgilio e il XVI. epodo di Orazio*. The resemblance of *Ecl.* IV. 21 and *Epod.* XVI. 33 and 49 does not necessitate dependence: anyhow



Virgil did not use Horace. L. Herrmann, *La IV<sup>e</sup> Bucolique virgilienne et l'histoire*. Against Carcopino's view of the child as Pollio's son, Saloninus, maintains that the child is Marcellus. The *puer* of *Aen.* VI. 875 recalls the *puer* of the Eclogue. P. Faider, *Camille* (*Enéide* VII. 803-817: XI. 498-915). Analyses the art of Virgil: traits in the picture from Harpalyce (*Aen.* I. 316, Hyginus, *Fab.* 193), Amazons, etc. Camilla is more than a graceful figure of fancy, and plays an essential part. E. Quélenec, *Cicéron dans ses villas*. Cicero's predilections among his villas, and how he occupied himself there. A. L. Corin, *Simples réflexions d'un curieux à propos des procès du 'Waltharius' et du 'Rudlieb'*. M. Hélin, *Goberti Laudunensis De tonsura et vestimentis et vita clericorum: édition critique précédée d'une introduction*.

## PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1931.

GREEK LITERATURE.—W. Schmid, *Untersuchungen zum gefesselten Prometheus*. Tübingen Beitr. z. Altertumswiss. Heft 9 [Stuttgart, 1929, Kohlhammer. Pp. viii + 116] (Körte). Entirely wrong conclusions, but useful collection of material.—*Eroticorum Græcorum fragmenta papyracea*. Primus collegit, recensuit, Latina interpretatione ditavit, verborum indices addidit B. Lavagnini [Leipzig, 1922, Teubner. Pp. 48] (Zimmermann). L. is thoroughly familiar with the problems both literary and textual. In view of a second edition reviewer discusses the text very fully and finds scope for criticism as well as for praise.—*Xenophon, Anabasis. Tome I, Livres I.-III.* Ed. P. Masqueray [Paris, 1930. Pp. xx + 177] (Gemoll). Contains text with critical notes, French translation, introduction, commentary, and map. Reasonable treatment of Xenophon's language. The many questions connected with X.'s life and the Anabasis are less satisfactorily handled.

LATIN LITERATURE.—*Carmina Burana. I. Band: Text. I. Die moral.-satir. Dichtungen. II. Band: Kommentar. I. Einleitung. Die moral.-satir. Dichtungen*. Mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten W. Meyers kritisch herausg. von A. Hilka u. O. Schumann. [Heidelberg, 1930, Winter. Pp. xvi + 112 and 96 + 120] (Manitius). A work of which German scholarship may be proud. The first critical text, with detailed commentary and most valuable introduction. Reviewer eagerly awaits further volumes.—H. Sjögren, *M. Tullii Ciceronis ad Atticum epp. II. sedecim. Fasc. II., ll. V.-VIII. continens* [Gothenburg, 1929, Eranos' Förlag. Pp. 199] (Philippson). S.'s main object is to establish the readings of the authoritative MSS. and to provide a reliable foundation. Warm gratitude is due to him for fulfilling this crying need.—*Cicéron, De l'orateur, livre troisième*. Texte éd. par H. Bornecque et trad. par E. Courbaud et H. Bornecque [Paris, 1930, Coll. Budé. Pp. iii + 117] (Philippson). Reason-

able text, well-chosen critical apparatus, and brilliant translation make this edition welcome, though as regards scholarship it contains nothing essentially new.—G. Funaioli, *Esegesi Virgiliana antica. Prolegomeni alla edizione del commento di Giunio Filargirio e di Tito Gallo* [Milan, 1930, Soc. ed. 'Vita e pensiero'. Pp. 509] (Wessner). F.'s articles in various periodicals are here collected in one volume.—A. Thierfelder, *De rationibus interpolationum Plautinarum* [Leipzig, 1929, Teubner. Pp. vi + 160] (Klotz). Valuable contribution to the textual history of Plautus. T. is well-schooled, and shows clear and sure judgment.—*Cicéron, Des termes extrêmes des biens et des maux. Tome II., livres III.-V.* Texte éd. et trad. par G. J. Martha [Paris, 1930, Coll. Budé. Pp. 174] (Philippson). Same good features as in Vol. I. Excellent translation, which partly compensates for scanty commentary. But critical apparatus is again needlessly overloaded. Good tables of contents and an index of proper names are given.

HISTORY.—W. L. Westermann, *Upon slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* [New York, 1929, Columbia Univ. Press. Pp. 69, and 1 plate] (K. F. W. Schmidt). Reviewer warmly recommends this excellent work to historians and lawyers.—W. Hüttl, *Verfassungsgeschichte von Syrakus* [Prague, 1929, Deutsche Gesellschaft. Der Wiss. u. Künste. Pp. 161] (Heichelheim). Useful account, though several addenda have already become necessary. H. is a careful and capable worker.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND EPIGRAPHY.—C. Vellay, *Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie* [Paris, 1930, 'Les Belles Lettres'] (Dörpfeld). Reviewer discusses at length the geographical extent of the Hellespont and rejects V.'s view that it was restricted to the Dardanelles.—F. Durrbach, *Inscriptions de Delos. Comptes des hiéropes (No. 372-498). Lois ou règlements, contrats d'entreprises et devis (No. 499-509)* [Paris, 1929, Champion. Pp. viii + 351] (Hiller v. Gaertfingen). Admirable work. Text and commentary prepared with utmost care.—J. G. O'Neill, *Ancient Corinth, Part I.* [Baltimore, 1930, Johns Hopkins Press. Pp. ix + 270] (Lenschau). O.N.'s careful topographical description of Old Corinth is an important advance on Byvanck in Pauly-Wissowa. Reviewer is less satisfied with his historical account.—*Athen, Akropolis*. Führer durch Griechenland, Heft I., von O. Walter [Vienna, 1929. Pp. 112, with 10 illustrations, 1 plate, and 1 plan of the Acropolis] (Kolbe). Very welcome as a thoroughly reliable guide. Reviewer discusses *ἀναθηρότομος, ἀρχαῖος νεώς*, and 'Urparthenon' at great length.—A. Hertz, *Die Kultur um den persischen Golf und ihre Ausbreitung*. Klio, Beiheft VII. N.F. [Leipzig, 1930, Dieterich. Pp. 152, with 15 illustrations on 8 plates] (Philipp). Very helpful as presentation of material (beginning with Ur) and formulation of problems. But the author's conclusions need frequent verification.—L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie. Tome I.: Commagène*

*et Cyrrhestique*, Nos. 1-256 [Paris, 1929, Geuthner. Pp. 135] (Honigmann). Carefully edited. Reviewer hopes for rapid continuation of this useful work.—H. R. W. Smith, *New aspects of the Menon painter*. Univ. of California Publications in Class. Arch., Vol. I., No. 1. [Berkeley, 1929, Univ. of California Press. Pp. 64, with 6 plates and 9 figures] (Lippold). An excellent investigation. If this new archaeological series maintains the high level of the first volume, it will be indispensable to archaeological libraries.—O. Broneer, *Terracotta Lamps. Corinth*, Vol.

*IV., Part II.* American School of Classical Studies at Athens [Cambridge, Mass., 1930. Pp. xx + 340] (Blümlein). Covers period from sixth century B.C. to Byzantine times and affords a good survey of development of types of lamp. The plates exhibit the individual pieces clearly. Copious bibliography. LANGUAGE.—A. Walde, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* [Berlin, 1926-1930, de Gruyter] (Hirt). Highly important work. Contains excellent information about origins of Greek and Latin words. An index is much needed and has been promised.

## CORRESPONDENCE

*The Editors, THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.*

SIRS,

Since we have now nearly completed for press the fourth volume of Livy (Books XXVI-XXX.), in the Oxford series of Classical Texts, we beg leave, in the interest both of that edition and of your readers, to correct a serious misconception which would naturally arise from a point in the generous notice of the third volume which appeared in *C.R.* XLIV. (1930), p. 134. This comment has been delayed by the absence of one of us in America, and by the tragical death of Mr. E. E. Genner at the time of his return. We are sure that he would have wished the facts to be made clear, and would not have doubted our gratitude for the serious and sympathetic study which he devoted to that volume. Indeed, he increased our gratitude by his kindness in responding to Professor Conway's private request for a list of the misprints which he had noted.

But in his review he speaks of our critical notes as being 'exhaustive,' and therefore criticises them for not reporting a considerable number of errors in the Puteanus which he had himself observed. As this is the third occasion on which this assumption has been wrongly made, in spite of the clear statement in our preface (Volume I., § 3), we must point out emphatically that while we have done our best to deal with every important point and on

every point dealt with to provide a complete report of the manuscript readings, it is physically impossible to deal with all the small points on which variations occur in the dozen or more authorities which we cite; and a glance at the correspondence between the editors and their long-suffering publishers would suffice to show why we spent much care in excluding information which we had obtained, but which we thought our readers could do without. All the cases which Mr. Genner cites of errors in P., and many others, were deliberately omitted. As he says, they are easily accessible in the facsimile to anyone who wants to enjoy the wickedness of that scribe in full.

Perhaps we ought to observe further that throughout the edition the critical notes, as the preface states, have been, and will be, the joint work of the editors, not of either alone except in passages where that is expressly stated. And we may confess frankly that the 'perversity' of holding that, where a mis-statement appears in the MSS., it is more likely to be due to a mistake of the scribes than to ignorance on the part of Livy, is a conviction, whether right or wrong, which has been forced upon the editors by the experience of many years' work.

Yours faithfully,  
R. S. CONWAY,  
S. K. JOHNSON.

*St. Albans,  
April 8, 1931.*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.*

\*.\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

*Allen* (T. W.) *Homeri Ilias*. Edidit T. W. A. Tomus I: Prolegomena. Pp. viii + 278. Tomus II libros I-XII continens. Pp. xiv + 356. Tomus III libros XIII-XXIV continens. Pp. xiii + 390. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 63s. net.  
*Baxter* (J. H.) *St. Augustine: Select Letters*.

With an English translation. Pp. lii + 535. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.  
*Beazley* (J. D.) *Der Berliner Maler*. Pp. 22 + 32 plates. (Bilder griechischer Vasen, Heft 2.) Berlin-Wilmersdorf: H. Keller, 1930. Paper.

- Bielmeier (A.)** Die neuplatonische Phaidrosinterpretation. Ihr Werdegang und ihre Eigenart. Pp. 96. (Rhetorische Studien, 16. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1930. Paper.
- Buecheler (F.)** Kleine Schriften. Dritter Band. Pp. 439. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 20 (unbound, 18).
- Cahen (E.)** Callimaque et son œuvre poétique. Pp. 655. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 134.) Paris: de Boccard, 1929. Paper.
- Campbell (J. M.) and McGuire (M. R. P.)** The Confessions of St. Augustine, Books I-IX (Selections). With Introductions, Notes, and Vocabulary. Pp. x+267. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1931. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum.** Vol. I. Part II. Cypriote and Etruscan. By F. N. Pryce. Pp. vii+261; 363 figures and 6 plates. London: British Museum, etc., 1931. Cloth, £1 net.
- Colson (F. H.) and Whitaker (G. H.)** Philo. With an English translation. In ten volumes. III. Pp. viii+512. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum.** Espagne, Fasc. 1 (Madrid: Musée Archéologique National, Fasc. 1.) Par J. R. Mélida. Letterpress and 30 plates. Grèce, Fasc. 1 (Athènes: Musée National, Fasc. 1.) Par K. A. Rhomaios. Letterpress and 18 plates. London: Milford, 1931. Boards, 24s. and 17s. 6d. net.
- Dahlöf (N.)** Tempora och Modi hos Columella. Pp. x+179. (Doktorsavhandlingar i Latinsk Filologi vid Göteborgs Högskola. VI.) Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1931. Paper.
- DeFerrari (R. J.)** Saint Basil: The Letters. With an English translation. In four volumes. III. Pp. xv+489. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Delage (E.)** La Géographie dans les Argonautiques d'Apollonios de Rhodes. Pp. 310. Biographie d'Apollonios de Rhodes. Pp. 82. (Bibliothèque des Universités du Midi, Fasc. XIX and XIX bis.) Bordeaux: Feret et Fils. 1930. 40 fr. and 12 fr.
- Derenne (E.)** Les Procès d'Impiété intentés aux Philosophes à Athènes au V<sup>me</sup> et au IV<sup>me</sup> Siècles avant J.-C. Pp. 271. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. XLV.) Liège: Vaillant-Carmanne; Paris: Champion, 1930. Paper, 50 fr.
- Duckett (E. S.)** Latin Writers of the Fifth Century. Pp. xix+271. New York: Henry Holt, 1930. Cloth.
- Edelstein (L.)** ΗΕΠΙ ΑΕΡΩΝ und die Sammlung der hippokratischen Schriften. Pp. viii+188. (Problemata: Forschungen zur klassischen Philologie. Heft 4.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1931. Paper, M.12.
- Edgar (C. C.)** Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection. Pp. xiv+211; 6 plates (Univ. of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXIV.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1931. Cloth.
- Eisler (R.)** The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' recently rediscovered 'Capture of Jerusalem' and the other Jewish and Christian sources. English edition by A. H. Krappe. Pp. xxviii+638; 40 plates. London: Methuen, 1931. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Errandonea (I.)** Sófocles. Tragedias. Tomo I. Edipo Rey, Edipo en Colono. Texto, traducción y notas. (Biblioteca de Clásicos Griegos y Latinos.) Pp. xxiii+170; 2 photographs of MSS. Madrid: Editorial Voluntad, 1930. Paper, 8 pesetas.
- Fraenkel (E.)** Gedanken zu einer deutschen Vergilfeier. Pp. 47. Berlin: Weidmann, 1930. Paper, M.1.50.
- Furness (R. A.)** Translations from the Greek Anthology. Pp. 239. London and Toronto: Jonathan Cape, 1931. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Gwatkin (W. E.)** Cappadocia as a Roman Procuratorial Province. Pp. 66. (The University of Missouri Studies, Vol. V, No. 4, Oct. 1, 1930.) Columbia: University of Missouri.
- Healey (J.)** The City of God, by Saint Augustine. Translated by J. H. With an introduction by E. Barker. Pp. xiv+252+265+269. London and Toronto: Dent, 1931. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Heath (Sir T. L.)** A Manual of Greek Mathematics. Pp. xvi+552. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Humbert (J.)** La Disparition du Datif en Grec (du I<sup>er</sup> au X<sup>e</sup> Siècle). Pp. xii+204. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris. — XXXIII.) Paris: Champion, 1930. Paper.
- Humbert (J.)** Polycratès. L'Accusation de Socrate et le Gorgias. Pp. 64. Paris: Klincksieck, 1930. Paper.
- Jackmann (G.)** Plautinisches und Attisches. Pp. 258. (Problemata, Heft 3.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1931. Paper, M.16.
- Jaeger (W.)** Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike. Acht Vorträge . . . herausgegeben von W. J. Pp. viii+128. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931. Cloth, RM. 6.80 (unbound, 5.60).
- Johnson (A. C.) and van Hoesen (H. B.)** Papyri in the Princeton University Collections. Pp. xxiii+145. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 10.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 34s. net.
- Judeich (W.)** Topographie von Athen. Pp. xii+478. Munich: Beck, 1931.
- Jullian (C.)** Au seuil de notre Histoire. Leçons faites au Collège de France. II. 1914-1923. Pp. 292. Paris: Boivin. Paper, 20 fr.
- King (J. E.)** Baedae Opera Historica. With an English translation. In two volumes. I. Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation, Books I-III. Pp. xxxv+505; map. II. Books IV and V. Pp. ix+517. (Loeb

- Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net each.
- Kirtland* (J. C.) *Ritchie's Fabulae Faciles. A First Latin Reader.* Authorized edition, revised. Pp. xi+182. New York, Toronto, etc.: Longmans, Green and Co., 1931. Cloth, 88 cents.
- Klein* (L.) *Die Göttertechnik in den Argonautica des Apollonios Rhodios.* Pp. 78. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1931. Paper.
- Lamb* (W. R. M.) *Lysias.* With an English translation. Pp. xxvi+707. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Mackenzie* (D. A.) *Myths from Melanesia and Indonesia.* Pp. xii+381; plates. *Myths and Traditions of the South Sea Islands.* Pp. x+406; plates. London: Gresham Publishing Company. Cloth.
- Malcovati* (H.) *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta.* Collegit, recensuit, prolegomenis illustravit H. M. Vol. I: pp. viii+249. Vol. II: pp. 219. Vol. III: pp. 214. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum, 56-58.) Turin etc.: Paravia, 1930. Paper, L. 20, 17, 17.
- Martin* (J.) *Symposion. Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form.* Pp. viii+320. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XVII. Band 1./2. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1931. Paper.
- Meyer* (C. H.) *Fontes historiae religionis slavicae.* Pp. 112. (Fontes historiae religionum, fasc. IV.) Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931. Paper, RM. 8.
- Mooney* (G. W.) *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum libri VII-VIII.* Galba. Otho. Vitellius. Divus Vespasianus. Divus Titus. Domitianus. With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. Pp. 662. London etc.: Longmans (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co.), 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Ovink* (B. J. H.) *Philosophische Erklärung der platonischen Dialoge Meno und Hippias Minor.* Pp. xi+206. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1930. Paper, 8s. 2d.
- Papyri Osloenses.* Fasc. II. Edited by S. Eitrem and L. Amundsen. Pp. xi+182, and (in a separate cover) 8 plates. Oslo: Dybwad, 1931. Paper.
- Reinhardt* (L.) *De Heronis Alexandrini dictione quaestiones selectae.* (Dissertatio inauguralis.) Pp. x+206. Borna: Noske, 1930.
- Robinson* (D. M.) *Excavations at Olynthus. Part III: The coins found at Olynthus in 1928.* Pp. xii+129; 2 figures, 28 plates. Part IV: *The terra-cottas of Olynthus found in 1928.* Pp. xii+105; 62 plates. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, Nos. 11, 12.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 45s. net each.
- Robinson* (D. M.), *Harcum* (C. G.) and *Iliffe* (J. H.) *A Catalogue of the Greek Vases in the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, Toronto.* 2 Vols. Vol. I. Pp. viii+288; Vol. II, 108 plates. University of Toronto Press, 1930.
- Sandfeld* (K.) *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats.* Pp. 242. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris.—XXXI.) Paris: Champion, 1930. Paper.
- Schneidewin* (W.) *Platons zweiter Hippiasdialog.* Gehalt, Beurteilung. Pp. 36. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1931. Paper, M. 1.50.
- Schroeder* (O.) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis selectis.* Tertium edidit O.S. Pp. xii+376. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 7 (unbound, 5.80).
- Serta Leodiensia.* . . . Mélanges de Philologie classique publiés à l'occasion du Centenaire de l'Indépendance de la Belgique. Pp. 327. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. XLIV.) Liège: Vaillant-Carmanne; Paris: Champion, 1930. Paper, 80 fr.
- Thackeray* (H. St. J.) *Sophocles and the Perfect Number. A neglected nicety.* Pp. 32. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVI.) London: Milford. Paper, 3s. net.
- Theiler* (W.) *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus.* Pp. x+166. (Problemata: Forschungen zur klassischen Philologie. Heft 1.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1930. Paper, M. 10.
- Timmer* (B. C. J.) *Megasthenes en de Indische Maatschappij.* Pp. 323. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1930. Paper, 8s. 4d.
- Tremenheere* (S. G.) *The Elegies of Propertius in a reconditioned text with a rendering in verse and a commentary.* Pp. xiv+539. London: Simpkin Marshall, 1931. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Vince* (J. H.) *Demosthenes: Olynthiacs, Philippics, Minor Public Speeches, Speech against Leptines.* With an English translation. Pp. xx+608. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1930. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Weinberger* (W.) *Wegweiser durch die Sammlungen altphilologischer Handschriften.* Pp. 136. (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Sph 209/4.) Vienna and Leipzig: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1930. Paper, M. 6.70.
- Weisäcker* (A.) *Untersuchungen über Plutarchs biographische Technik.* Pp. 122. (Problemata: Forschungen zur klassischen Philologie, Heft 2.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1931. Paper, M. 8.
- Wright* (F. A.) and *Sinclair* (T. A.) *A History of Later Latin Literature from the Middle of the Fourth Century to the End of the Seventeenth Century.* Pp. vii+418. London: Routledge, 1931. Cloth, 18s. net.



Archaeology,  
viii + 288 ;  
of Toronto

ique. Prob-  
(Collection  
de Linguis-  
Champion,

Hippiasdia-  
36. Pader-  
M.1.50.

cum frag-  
O.S. Pp.  
m. Teubn.)  
RM. 7 (un-

e Philologie  
Centenaire  
e. Pp. 327.  
philosophie et  
asc. XLIV.)  
ris : Cham-

nd the Per-  
ty. Pp. 32.  
the British  
: Milford.

des Neu-  
problemata :  
Philologie.  
30. Paper,

en de In-  
Amsterdam :

s of Proper-  
a rendering  
p. xiv + 539.  
931. Cloth,

thiaks, Phi-  
es, Speech  
lish transla-  
al Library.)  
Cloth, 10s.

die Samm-  
riften. Pp.  
en in Wien,  
g : Hölder-  
M. 6.70.

über Plu-  
Pp. 122.  
klassischen  
Weidmann,

) A History  
e Middle of  
the Seven-  
London :  
t.

JUL 31 1931

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.